FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2008

The Conference met in the Regency Ballroom in Omni Shorham Hotel, 2500 Calvert Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 8:30 a.m., Jay Hein, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, presiding

PRESENT

Jay Hein, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director, White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives;

Olivia Biggs, CVS Corporation;

Felix Pcaob. Camacho, Governor of Guam;

Danny Cortes, Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff, Esperanza;

Fred Davie, President, Public/Private Ventures;

David Eisner, CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service;

Virginia Walden Ford, Executive Director, D.C. Parents for School Choice;

Bill Galston, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution;

Stephen Goldsmith, Chairman, Corporation for National and Community Service;

Byron Johnson, Professor of Sociology, and Director, Institute for Studies of Religion, Baylor University;

Lisa Johnson, Skill Development Manager, Missouri Department of Economic Development;

Thomas Kirk, PhD, Commissioner, Connecticut, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services;

Joe Lieberman, United States Senate;

Scott Mccallum, President and CEO, Aidmatrix Foundation;

Jedd Medefind, Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director, White Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives;

Scott Merriner, Co-Chair, Governor's Advisory Council on Faith-Based & Community Initiatives, Alaska;

Richard Nathan, Co-Director, Rockefeller Institute of Government;

Brent Orell, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, U.S. Department of Labor;

Hal Roark, Executive Director, The Broadmoor Development Corporation;

Karri Schultheis, Project Director, Arizona Women's Education And Employment, Inc.;

Jannah Scott, Policy Advisor fro Faith-Based Community Initiatives for the Office of Janet Napolitano;

Bruce Wilkinson, Senior Vice President, International Programs, World Vision;

Karl Zinsmeister, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, The White House;

PROCEEDINGS:

MS. WIEBE: We are in for an amazing day today, 50,000-foot level you heard yesterday, we're going to get down a little bit more in the weeds. You're going to pull out your pen and paper, hear examples of replicable models, amazing results from across the country, hopefully some beginning of partnerships for you as well. And I hope this is a very profitable day for you as well. I want to belay announcements for later and begin

right in with our program. We have some very -- guests we're honored to have today. I'd like to welcome our Director, Jay Hein, to come to the platform and begin with our first speaker. And while we're waiting for Jay to come, we do have sign language interpreters. So if any of you would like to use that service, please feel free to move over to the left, or make that aware. And if our interpreters aren't aware of anyone this morning, they'll discontinue. Thank you.

MR. HEIN: Good morning. It's a delight to have you back today. What a special day we had together yesterday. We heard from the President of the United States. We heard from Cabinet officials. We heard from so many other leaders across the country that describe how the Federal Government has been fundamentally changed to be more aware of what you do in your communities, to be bent in our policies and our apparatus to serve you and equip you and lift up your arms. And that was on display. It was a great encouragement to us all. We were inspired, of course by the clients who shared their stories, whose three to four minute story was the equivalent of a 45-minute speech because it just spoke volumes of the work that you do on their behalf. And I'm not sure I've ever been at a conference before where videos got applauded. But it happened yesterday because of the inspiration in those stories as well. So we had a remarkable day. It was a high-level day.

And today we're going to unpack those big concepts and we're going to talk about not the Federal Government as much. But instead, social entrepreneurship, what it takes to revitalize communities through your efforts from the bottom up, which is indeed how we're governing with that appreciation. But this is an initiative that isn't born in Washington, or driven by Washington. It's driven by each of your actions in your communities. And that will be on display today. And we're going to talk about the research that's showing us the new chapters of this story, a greater understanding of what works, what doesn't and why, and how we can continue to improve our collaboration together. So, it's a very rich day.

I talked yesterday about the 200 speakers that we have for you at the plenary sessions and in the workshops. So, we talked about the number. I didn't talk about the quality. The speakers in those workshops are head liners at conferences all throughout the year. And so you've got to work hard to find them in workshops because we have such a plentiful set of talent that I just commend to you. And so you're going to leave today emboldened, encouraged and equipped. And so today could have been a conference in itself. So, you got the inspiration yesterday, day hallelujah today. You're really going to go to work. And when we used words yesterday about this is all about the future, this isn't just looking to the past, it's

looking toward working better together. That work's going to get done in large measure today. And we have the ideal first person to speak to us about this initiative and to begin today's conversation. Because I'm now honored to invite to the stage, Senator Joseph Lieberman, United States Senator from Connecticut. You can applaud too, but I'm going to say a couple more things about him. (Applause)

Senator Lieberman, we are so deeply honored that you're here because your voice has been so profound in this movement. You have been a terrific champion on Capitol Hill as United States Senator. You've brokered and lead the negotiations in the Senate that lead to Senate passage of the CARE Act, the legislation early on in this initiative. And that was a vital and important work. But your voice has been so meaningful beyond even legislation. You've spoken to religious tolerance issues. You've spoken to the public value of private faith and how that transforms communities and culture into so many of us. You're an impressive public official, a United States Senator, but you're beyond partisanship and you're just a great Statesman. For the cause that we're here -- (Applause) With all those reasons, I welcome you. Thank you.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: Well, thank you very much. I thank you ladies and gentlemen for that warm welcome. I normally don't get that kind of welcome at this hour of the day. (Laughter) I will tell you a story from when I was in college. I brought one weekend, a friend of mine home with me. And as we were heading back to New Haven, to Yale, he said to me, "I really liked your parents. And just, they seem so supportive of you." He says, "I have this vision, Joe, that when you were a child, and you got up in the morning and came downstairs for breakfast, your parents gave you a standing ovation." (Laughter): Well, it wasn't quite that way, but anyway, thank you for making me feel at home this morning.

I want to thank Jay, and I want to thank everyone that works with the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. I want to thank all of you for what you do across American and what you believe and what you do from your belief. And I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to come and speak with you for a few moments this morning. I'm going to come to the end of my remarks at the beginning. And then, I'm going to go back and fill in. Because what I really want to leave you with is what I think you know, and I want to share with you, a hope. Which is, that what you know of course is, is that our country, our government, is at a time of transition now.

We're having a presidential election. You knew that, right? Yes. (Laughter) And it is -- and perhaps you don't know this. The first time in 56 years that neither the incumbent president or vice president has

sought the presidency if you will, not running for re- election, the vice president running. So, it's a real time of transition. And we make a choice which is large, but it includes many parts under it when we decide who to vote. And I want to say that I come this morning to thank you and our friends at the White House in the FBCI office for all you have done to give these programs credibility, to prove that they're effective, and to say that my greatest hope at this time of transition as we head to a new administration, is that the controversy that has occasionally surrounded these programs, is over. And that whoever is elected president and carries us forward, will not only respect but embrace the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and sustain these programs on into the future. (Applause)

Now, that's my conclusion. Now, I want to come back, and if you will, in the spirit of this group, I want to just be a little bit personally reflective. And tell you how I -- but I think not unusually for people growing up in this country, came to the belief that I had about these programs and the faith-based initiatives particularly when I first began to deal with them and discover them and try to support them in my public life. Look, I always say that, talking about my parents again for the second time, I was blessed from the first second of my life. First of course, because I was alive. But second, because I was given wonderful parents. And one of the blessings that they gave me is the blessing of faith and the example of their own lives, the way they lives based on that faith. And my own models, my mom and dad, of what it meant and throughout the earliest years of my childhood on into my teenage years, and beyond of course, of what faith meant, was that faith meant that you are of service.

The tradition that I grew up in, like all religious traditions, taught me that faith was critical, and the rituals of my religion, which is quite ritualistic, were very important. But ultimately, we were going to be judged by our deeds. The prophets speak so loudly and passionately to the Children of Israel saying, you know, Don't come to the temple and bring your sacrifices and celebrate my new moons and think -- and this being the voice of God speaking through the prophet --that I'll be satisfied, if you are not treating each other with mercy, if you are not caring for the orphans and the widows and those who are in need. And I watched my mom and dad in different, you know, the millions of small community-based, faith-based programs that nobody really much ever hears about or didn't hear about for a long time here in Washington, helping people.

My mother passed away three years ago, just about, actually this past week. And until the end, almost the very end of her life, she led a group in Stanford, Connecticut that her mother had led before her, with a name that is so quaint it is antiquated: The Hebrew Ladies Educational League. And what did they

do? They raised money with little fund raisers. And they had basically, I don't know what the term of art would be, but a generalized, available fund for those who needed it. This was long before governmental welfare programs or support programs. And my mother, who wonderfully never revealed names or anything, would tell me stories until the end about the children who came and said as their mother was dying of cancer, or didn't have money to give her a proper burial. And so, my mom would write out a check from the Hebrew Ladies Educational League, or another family whose daughter was getting married, and they couldn't afford to buy a decent wedding dress. And so they'd do that, and on, and on, and on. A woman who has had cancer, and she couldn't get compensated for exactly the kind of wig she wanted to wear because she had lost her hair, et cetera, et cetera.

These were small, and yet very large and powerful examples to me. As I grew, and began to study and learn American history, particularly, I put that personal experience into the larger context of our National experience, indeed, I would say, our National purpose and carrying it a bit further, even our National destiny. I believe that America is a faith-based initiative. I believe that American is a faith-based initiative, and why do I say that? (Applause)

After the first sort of preface sentence of the Declaration of Independence, which is the original American document, at the moment of our Nation's official birth, remember what is said there, "The self-evident truth that all of us are created and endowed by our Creator," not by the wise men who wrote the Declaration, not by the philosophers of the enlightenment who were quite influential at the time, but the endowment was from our Creator to give us those rights, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Applause) And remember what it says in the next -- this is why I say America is a faith-based initiative. In the very next sentence, it says, "In order to secure those rights, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which are the endowment of our Creator," the founders were declaring that there is a United States of America.

Go to the first President of the United States, George Washington. You could quote so many of our founders, but Washington in his farewell address, which seems to stay relevant as long as any politician speech I've ever read. It may be right up there with Lincoln's Second Inaugural. He said, and I paraphrase, I don't have it in front of me, that he said to the American people as he left office, Do not indulge the supposition that American can be a good country, the country we want it to be, without the force of religion. And I have always believed that what George Washington meant was, that we were

that they, were creating a government of limited powers. They were creating a government that was defining itself against the monarchy from which they had come in England. This was going to be the government of the people, by the people and for the people. So, freedom of individuals would be protected and held high.

But, that also meant that the government couldn't do everything for everybody all the time, and certainly, couldn't control everybody's behavior all the time with a law that governed every moment. It would be ultimately up to the individual personal, moral choices of every American. And I think Washington meant that in two ways. One was, the law can tell you not to assault each other, not to cheat each other, but ultimately, there will be moments when the law won't be present and you will have to be guided by some inner moral compass that will tell you, no, I shouldn't do this. But the second part I have always believed, was that Washington, who was a great visionary, was saying -- was seeing forward and saying, over time there are many things this government will try to do for its citizens. But never expect, citizens in need, but never expect that this government will be able to do it all. And therefore, we will rely on the moral imperatives of your faith to create programs that will assist those in need.

I'll skip forward to when I was privileged to be elected to the Senate in 1988. I came in 1989, and I both first watched and then participated vigorously in this central question of the extent to which government should be supportive of faith-based organizations when they were attempting to help people. I state that in the broadest possible terms. And I will say that, as these debates took shape in the '90s, first, there was a recognition that you know, some of this had already been happening. That there were a lot of churches around America that had had preschool programs, and childcare programs forever. That there were Catholic Charities and Jewish Federations and the Lutheran Charities, et cetera, et cetera, and some many more that had been doing these works and in different ways had benefitted without real formal governmental action from governmental benefit programs to the benefit of their -- of the people they were serving.

But as there were attempts during the Clinton Administration, and you know, as we go to this time of transition, without knowing who our next president is, acknowledging the extraordinary role, and I'll get to this in a moment, that President Bush has played in bringing these programs forward, it is important to remember that President Clinton was generally supportive of the idea of faith-based initiatives. But it was very controversial in Congress. And that surprised me. Because I know that my colleagues had, most of whom had grown up in religious homes, and had had their own faith examples of religious service. And

what I saw was, a concern that perhaps these programs supporting faith-based groups would violate the First Amendment guarantee that there would be no establishment of religion and the Government would never abridge the Freedom of Religion. I remember, actually, it was on Meet the Press with our dear friend, Tim Russert, a real blessed memory. And I was in a debate with Mario Cuomo about this. And I remember saying, Do I, my family, society, have -- I said, I'm going to pose this choice. Do we have more to fear from a drug-addict, who broke his addiction in a faith-based drug treatment program, that led to his commitment to Christianity, or Judaism, or Islam; do we have more to fear from that process and person, or from a drug-addict who was not helped and continued to be involved in robbery, mugging, to support his habit? (Applause)

To me the answer was clear. And I must say, in the spirit of -- I don't want to be too judgmental, but I want to -- I was about to be a little too theological, I want to say, about three or four years later, I said to Tim Russert, we were talking about that who. And he said, you know, I just saw Mario Cuomo, and he said, he now concludes that you were right. (Laughter) SENATOR LIEBERMAN: And so, I know I heard Governor Cuomo say that since then. The whole idea that these faith-based groups would have to be barred from getting Federal funds they needed to do good works, because, for the sole reason, for instance, that on the wall of the room where these needed services were being delivered, there was a Christian cross, a Jewish Star of David, a Muslim crescent moon, or because they had a religious name in their title, or a praise God in their mission statement. None of this made any sense when you compare to what was actually being done.

So, then comes President Bush and elected in 2000. And as you may remember I had some involvement in that particular election. (Laughter) So it was truly in the spirit of reconciliation that all of our faiths urge on us, and really the initiative I must say, came from the President himself. That in January of 2001, I was surprised and delighted to be invited by the White House, along with my colleague and coworker, former Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum, to go with the President in that first week or two of his administration, to the Fishing School here in Washington. They don't teach fishing. That's the name. This is an award-winning, faith- based program, right here in the District that provides after school tutoring programs and hot meals to students who might otherwise have neither of those. The founder of the school, Tom Lewis, an ex-policeman, motivated by his faith, saw a real need here, stepped in to fill it when government and traditional charities either were not or could not. And he was -- so the question that that story raised as the President said that day, Should the Federal Government refuse to partner and support

Tom Lewis and others like him in this successful program because he was inspired by his faith in God, and because part of the program for these children was inspirational readings, faith-based readings to build their self-esteem? The answer was, of course not. That's no threat to the First Amendment, no establishment of religion, no abridgment of freedom of religion, surely as the founders of our country intended it. I remember that standing there at that school that day, President Bush said, and I quote, "There are so many people in need. The good news about America is that there are so many willing to serve. It's the great strength of our County. Government of course, cannot fund and will not fund religious activities, but when people of faith provide social services, we must not discriminate against them." And he was so absolutely right. (Applause)

And that's the point, where you and the phrase that I know you're familiar with, we're leveling the playing field. He said, Let's open the Federal grant process to any organization, faith-based or otherwise, that knows its community, has a drive to do something to raise up the community, help those in need and can get results. And then let's evaluate those programs to see whether they're successful as we do every other program. Seven years later, as you gather here at the end of the Administration of President George W. Bush, thanks to the President, his vision, his steadfastness. Some of us in Congress who have followed his lead, the work of the Office in the White House, and most of all, to the way all of you and your programs have proved the merit, the affect of what you are doing. We can now say that this works. This has helped countless of our fellow Americans in need. Local groups working through the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives have mentored thousands of children with parents in prison, helped move thousands of homeless from the streets to shelters or a residence, allowed hundreds of thousands of drug-addicts to choose recovery, the recovery program they with the choice we have now put into so many of these programs, believe will work best for them, created new prisoner re-entry programs that cut the recidivism rate in half. In 2006, members I'm sure you know, \$14.7 billion in competitive grants, competitive grants, that went to nonprofit organizations working on behalf of the most vulnerable Americans, \$2.2 billion went to faith-based groups without causing an abridgment of the First Amendment or anything but good results throughout the United States of America. (Applause)

So, this is the record. These are the results. These are the facts that will be there for whoever is honored and privileged to enter the oval office on January 20th of next year. And I express the hope, and may I say here, the prayer, that whoever that is, will embrace, sustain and expand the work done by the

Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and reach out to Congress to pass bipartisan legislation that can make permanent and even more robust all that you have done for America. (Applause)

You will not be surprised to hear that I stand ready to help in that regard in any way I can, with the belief, the faith and the conclusion based on fact, that as you serve God with gladness, you also serve America with great results. Thank you very much. God Bless and good luck to you all. (Applause)

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURISM AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN COMPASSION

MR. HEIN: Thank you Senator Lieberman. As advertised, a statesman's voice, someone who shares your passion, has been a national leader for decades on the issues that we care about. And we have a privilege to turn our attention to another voice, who for as long, has been one of our nation's very finest implementers of these ideas. If I could, I'd like to invite Steve Goldsmith and David Eisner both to join me on stage. (Applause)

Steve Goldsmith is going to speak next. And I want to say a few things about him that is so meaningful to me. As a two-term mayor of Indianapolis, he lived in the city that I lived in for a season. And his innovation in side government, in making government work on behalf of the taxpayers, was not only, and most importantly, important to the people of our city, but he became such an important national model that other cities replicated his crime reduction strategies and his performance-oriented government strategies. But he understood the heart of a city and the problem-solving approach of city, also exceeded the fine public servants of city hall. And so the way he mobilized what President Bush calls the Armies of Compassion, also became a national model. And that's why Candidate George W. Bush enlisted Steve Goldsmith as a policy advisor, and that's why the speech the President gave, or the speech the President referred to yesterday, his first speech as candidate, was in Indianapolis at one of the sites that Steve Goldsmith led and that he might speak about in his remarks now. But he has since become Chairman of the Corporation for National Community Service, where he works with David Eisner. Henry Lozano, if you could please stand. I'd like to recognize our colleague in U.S.A. Freedom Corp. He's a partner in this effort (Applause).

The four of us are collaborators to fulfill the President's vision for a citizenship agenda. How to create more volunteer service, more effective service. How to create more dynamic partnerships with the nonprofit sector. These are the elements of Social Entrepreneurship that will be on display today. And

Steve Goldsmith has both implemented those ideas and expanded them, and now is a Professor at Harvard, teaches us all about them. And so it's with great delight on a personal level, and as someone, Chairman Goldsmith, who still carries the flag and advances our cause, I know we're all in your debt. So, thank you very much for joining us today and for your service.

HON. GOLDSMITH: Thanks Jay. I can't tell if you were a constituent when I was mayor. Were you? And did you vote for me? (Laughter) I appreciate Jay's leadership. He's a long-time friend and his pragmatic approach to how faith can help citizens has been a terrific source of inspiration over the last year or two I'd like to mention the President's Armies of Compassion Speech, I'd like to start with that. I watched how Senator Lieberman did this. Start with that, then go back two years, and then come forward and do all that in about ten minutes. But I was a district attorney for 12 years, have a number of partnerships in faith-based organizations. And so then I got, the day I was elected mayor, I really got a lesson though in the importance of faith-based operations to city hall, because there was this pastor who I had worked with in inner cities for a number of years. His name was Arthur Johnson. And he was like 6'7". And he was 65 years old, but he looked like Kevin Garrett does today, you know. And he said, I want you to come to my church on Sunday morning, the morning after you're elected. And I said, Okay, I'll come. Because I had known him for a long time. And he said, I want everybody to stand up and hold hands and I'm going to pray that the mayor fixes our sidewalks. Right? (Laughter)

And we're going to continue to pray until he sees the light. Right? So, it was at that moment that I truly understood the importance of the faith-based network in our city. In 1999, the President began his campaign in Indianapolis as Jay mentioned. I don't want to talk about that much except that Armies, if you haven't read the Armies of Compassion speech, you should read it. It is a remarkable speech. But even more remarkable to me was watching then Governor Bush, before that speech. And the speech took, the first speech in the campaign to place in an Indianapolis church. And the President visited a couple of sites and talked to some young men and women. I still have a picture of it in the wall of my office up at Harvard.

And I remember one of those events because he was talking to a group of individuals. And he said to one of the young men, you know, what are you doing, and what had you been doing? And this is a fellow who had had some trouble with drugs. And he said, Well, you know, what happens -- what are you going to do in the future and how are you going to progress? And he said, God's got a plan for me. I'm going to make it. All right. And that's what this young man told the President, Governor at the time. As we walked

through, and heard more of those testimonials and saw both how the Governor inspired them, and how they more importantly inspired the Governor, that was the beginning of the set up of the Armies of Compassion speech that equated great hope. And that brings us to today. But before we do that, and my hope today, is to kind of frame what I think the role of government should be. So, those of you who are doing good deeds who aren't with government, can go back and tell your mayors or governors or cabinet secretaries or bureaucrats kind of a way that they might consider approaching a problem. So, let me do this very quickly.

So before the Armies of Compassion speech, like going back eight or nine years. I began this effort to rebuild Indianapolis's inner-city neighborhood. And Indianapolis is a city a little bigger than Washington, D.C., and we have our share of problems. And I won't take you though all that. But I have done everything I can conceive of to rebuild the seven most neglected neighborhoods in our city, 8- to 20,000 people each, all of which, had the kind of at-risk indicators that you would all be able to pick out yourself. And I created a very large pot of government money and I tried to make government responsive. And we worked in these seven neighborhoods and then we stepped back and we said, How are we doing? And a few of the neighborhoods were doing okay. And these were more like communities than small neighborhoods. And a few of them were not doing very well. We were making the same mistake that's been made over the years. We're assuming that if government spends enough money and enough energy and has enough activity, that will make life resilient for individuals in communities that have been neglected. Let's try this a different way. Let's go back and map all the assets in those neighborhoods. Let's say that the role of government is not to manage bureaucrats more effectively, but the role of government is to produce public value live for those that live in your community, produce opportunity for the citizens that live in your community and what are the assets that can do that? Right. And the Armies of Compassion speech, the President had summed it up and this is now, I'm kind of jumping back and forth in terms of time, with respect to compassion and hope and inspiration. And we identified the assets in those communities, and unsurprisingly the predominant asset was just institution, right? In our city, it was the church.

You know, there was occasionally there was a small business, or a community center, or a secular group, but there were hundreds, hundreds of faith-based organizations, predominantly they were churches in those neighborhoods. You know, there were three to four hundred congregants. They were led by an assistant pastor that had outreach programs, and these were people who had -- who were working a job during the day and ministering at night and one weekends. And then we said, why don't we consider how

we can leverage and help them. How we can find out what their issues are. And formally, some of you have read about this, came known as the Front Porch Alliance which was an office in city hall in Indianapolis that said, these eight people who work for the mayor are going to spend every day knocking on the doors of those assets saying, how can we help, and how can we partner with you. And the answer often was not, We want your money, from the church or the mosque, or the synagogue, but predominantly the church. It was, you know, why don't you do your job and close down the crack house across the street. Or, why don't you repair the street. Or, why don't you take that vacant lot and turn it into a playground. Or, maybe you could use your influence to get us some computers for our preschool, and so on. And thousands of small acts of compassion came just from what became known as Civic Switchboard, operating as Civic Switchboard.

So, I just lay that out because, often we kind of -- we look at these billions of dollars, and we look at the grant process and it's made a huge difference. But fundamentally, not just leveling the playing field, but if government does its role right and looks to itself as an activator of a network, the network is for-profit, notfor-profit, and faith-based organizations, and government and how they work together to produce value. So, from that Front Porch Alliance, eventually came this office that Jay so ably leads. And this -- there are a lot of things that Senator Lieberman said that we now take for granted that weren't at all taken for granted at the time. I know I had this one moment near the end of my term as mayor where I said, let's use some of this HUD money for homeless shelters for the Salvation Army and other faith-based organizations. And I still remember this kind of mid-level bureaucrat walked into my office and said, You can't do it. You say I can't do it? I'm mayor. I can do it. Spend the money for the faith-based shelters. And he said, You can't do it. And then I remember this moment, opened up the HUD regulations and showed me the CDBG Regulation that said, If you take government's money, you have to take down your cross, essentially. Right, in other words, you can take government's money, this is pre the Office of Faith-Based Initiative, if you promise to act like government and not like a religious institution. And so, that moment then, led to this wonderful effort that Jay is referring now, where virtually every cabinet agency has a faith-based office, the job of which is to weed out the discrimination against the faith-based organizations so they can do the right thing. (Laughter)

So if we fast forward, 1999, now you're up to 2008. And we see terrific work that's been done. Jay handed me, I hadn't given him my material in advance, I have to confess. Jay handed me this book, which I have memorized of course last night, the President's Faith-Based and Community Initiative in 50 states. I

just want to, you know, I've been at this now for 25 years. This is really a remarkable document. Not because of the way it was written, but because it exists. That there are -- there's enough of this that we could do a document about it, right? (Applause)

And just go through it and pick your state and this could not have been written eight years ago. It could not have been written eight years ago, and it represents a quite remarkable change in how government looks at its ability to partner with faith-based organizations. Now we have a lot of problems. And let me just make two other points here. Obviously, it's a difficult time for a lot of Americans. It may be a difficult time for them in terms of their jobs. If they're young adults in an inner city school, their chances of graduating from high school are really quite slim. If they're an African American male in an inner city high school, their chances of graduating from high school, even worse. We have financial literacy issues, we have huge prisoner re-entry issues, many things that are going to be facing our country and we have cities and states that are stressed, very stressed financially in this difficult time.

And at the same time that we see these substantial challenges, we look around Jay's office with the Secretary of Education sponsored a conference a month or so ago, about religious schools in inner cities. And pointed out the fact that 1,162 faith- based schools have closed their doors, 424,000 students no longer go to those faith-based schools despite for example, in the Catholic schools that the dropout rate is nil as contrasted to the school that may be down the block. So, we have a problem. We have a solution. We have a challenge and we have to put them together. I would look at those things the following way and maybe you all know this, but maybe saying these things quickly would allow us to kind of think about it. This is a very interesting moment in time. Not just because there's a presidential election, but because of the following. A, as Senator Lieberman has said, there is universal respect and support for the Faith-Based Initiative. It's a rare mayor and governor, and I think no matter who the next president is, it will be even rarer then that somebody doesn't appreciate the importance of the work that you do. So that is baked in and that's a starting point.

Second, and David Eisner will talk about this in a minute, this is an interesting and remarkable point in time for volunteerism. The whole purpose here is not for government to monopolize good deeds, but for it to allow citizens, American citizens, to help other citizens. And the interest in volunteerism from young adults, the millennials, the 18 to 24 year olds, the 9/11 generation, is at a record high since World War II. We have a huge opportunity to translate the good hearts and action of young adults into volunteerism and service. And that is a point and a moment in time that will allow congruence with support

and acceptance of the Faith-Based Initiative. We also have baby boomers retiring in record numbers who are available and ready, and more often do their service and volunteerism through faith-based organizations than through any other single outlet. We have new technologies. And I know, many of you may not have a full appreciation that the FaceBook technologies are good for the country. But they do, there are many applications of those technologies that allow young adults to form together to do good deeds. If we can figure out how to harness those good deeds to many of the institutions and organizations and faith-based initiatives that are in the room and throughout the country, we'll have even larger resources to apply.

And we have a new group of folks who call themselves Social Entrepreneurs, civil and social entrepreneurs. They may be faith-based entrepreneurs; they may be not- for-profit entrepreneurs. And what they're saying is, look, I'm going to look at a problem, and I'm going to try to figure out how to solve that problem. I'm going to figure out how to solve the dropout problem. I'm going to figure out how to reduce the violence problem. And these social entrepreneurs are configuring a group of philanthropic resources and city resources and federal resources around a new solution in transforming them in a way that, transforming the solution in a way that makes the problem go away. So we have all of the, a congruence of time, like volunteers, and acceptance of faith-based initiatives, social entrepreneurs, huge problems, and that means that people with good ideas and great hearts can make a big difference. Now, how do you do that in your community? How do you do that in your city? How do you make more space for good to occur? Let me just say it this way: A) you've got to insist on results. There's no city or state or federal government any longer that should say, we're going to fund the same old set of activities regardless of whether they do any good. We're going to form, fund results and when we do, people in the room will benefit. (Applause)

Once there is performance measurement, then it will be impossible for the bureaucrats to hide behind failed answers. And those who provide affective solutions can do it. So a dialog in a community that says, United Way, the Community Foundation, the City of Indianapolis, the State of Indiana, the Federal Government ought to fund results, opens up space for entrepreneurs, opens up space for faith-based and secular entrepreneurs, will make a very big difference.

Second, in every community, there is a champion for these activities. Rarely it's a government official, but it can be the mayor from time-to-time. It can be an entrepreneur at United Way agent, it can be a group of faith-based readers, right, it could be a philanthropist with resources to prove that something can

work. And finding that champion and harnessing the energies of that champion can then drag along the rest of the sectors in a way that makes a difference.

Third, I heard this great phrase. I went to a funeral of a good friend who was the general superintendent of United Pentecostals. And one of the pastors said, I really appreciate Pastor Urshan, because he fought against the curse of professionalism. And by that, he meant that where those bureaucrats hidden in places, including city government, that said, Look, if you want to help people in our community, you have to do it the way we tell you to do it. You have to have Masters in Social Work, you have to use our curricula, you have to do it this way. The curse of professionalism then squeezes out the ability for people with compassion and new approaches to make their work successful. So, if we really look at how to open up space in a community, fighting against the curse of professionalism will be important as well.

And lastly as many of you know, many of these big government programs have their own sense of arrogance, which is, we really don't trust folks who are in need to make informed choices about where they should get help. So, we're not going to give them vouchers. And we're not going to give them choices. We're going to tell them where to go. And to the extent that in a community or in a Federal Government, that we can provide resources to people in need, and they can choose where they'll go, then they'll go to the effective places represented in the room. So, fighting for space to be helpful involves fighting for domain side solutions as well as supply side solutions. So, if you back up to all that, it's a very interesting time. Huge set of challenges. Great progress that's been made. But a congruence of opportunity. American optimism, American interest in volunteerism, spread of the Faith-Based Initiative, can come together to create room for entrepreneurs that will make a huge difference. So, I'm just here, I've been at this for 25 years. I very rarely get invited to speak anymore. This is really a big deal for me. (Laughter)

I just want to say, just read in the report and hear in Jay and the Senator and the President, and seeing your faces and your commitment is indeed inspirational. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Thanks so much. I'm Chairman of the Corporation for National Community Service, which means, I get to take credit for whatever the speaker does, unless he makes a mistake, in which case, it was his decision. (Laughter)

And we in brief conversation with the President in 2000, talked about Americorps programs and the Vista programs and the Learn and Serve programs, and there was substantial anxiety among many members in Congress about those programs and their tilt if you will. And the question became, you know,

how should those programs operate in a way that helps more people. How can they be friendly to faith-based initiatives. How could they be more effectively run, and how could they build on a foundation where lots of people are trying to do good deeds but often were restricted. And that Corporation for National Community Service was fortunate enough to recruit one of the country's most talented not-for-profit executives who has straightened out the administration, stretched the reach, dramatically changed the approached to faith-based initiatives and I hope set a foundation that will create benefit for the next administration as well. Please help me greet David Eisner.

MR. EISNER: So how would you like to follow Steve Goldsmith knowing, that you are a federal bureaucrat. (Laughter) I find that's my challenge on more than just speaking occasions. It is although such a pleasure to work with Steve, who is the just rare combination of a visionary plus an extraordinary master of execution. Steve did a great job explaining the incredible opportunity and challenges that we have in front of us. And all I'm going to do is put a little bit of a punctuation point on the relationship between service across our nation and the Faith-Based and Community Initiative.

I want to start off by saying thank you for all of your incredible work. And I'm thanking you on behalf of our 75,000 Americorp members, 500,000 participants in our Seniorcorp programs, 1.3 million students across the country that serve in their communities as a result of our Learn and Serve America program, and the 2-million Americans that our service participants enlist to serve next to them every year. And I just - I want to touch quickly on three things. Why service is so important as a connection to the Faith-Based and Community Initiative, why we need to work better together, and then finally, some very tangible ways that I hope you will be able to turn to the Corporation for National Service, and receive support for what you're doing.

So throughout this conference, you've heard of the amazing need. And Steve reiterated it. And the numbers are staggering, 15 million kids who need caring adults and don't have one in their lives, 13 million children living in poverty, 650,000 prisoners coming out of prison landing on the front doorsteps of our communities no place to live, no place to work, no connection to the social fabric of the community, 800,000 of our young people involved in gangs, and 50 percent of our kids in inner cities not graduating from high school. And the most amazing thing is the consensus that's developed over the last decade, that we don't have a better intervention than when a citizen stands up and says, I care. I'm going to put my time, I'm going to put my life, in the way of this opportunity to fail. And I'm going to turn that into an opportunity to

succeed. And whether we're looking at the statistics on children of prisoners, where for one hour a week for a year, a mentor cuts in half what's otherwise a 70 percent likelihood that they're going to go to prison themselves. Or, we look at the dropout crisis, where tutors and mentors can dramatically change the likelihood that somebody stays in school, or the opportunity for a community member in a church or a synagogue to reach out to somebody who is re-entering society and cut by two-thirds the likelihood that they're going to go back to prison because they don't have a job, or they don't have a place to live or they're not connected. It's an extraordinary opportunity.

But we're not getting it done together. My community, which is generally nonprofit and a lot of secular folks, are not effectively connecting with the community of faith-based organizations. And one statistic is incredibly striking. When you look across the 60 million Americans that volunteer, in any community between 30 and 50 percent of them come from out of the faith-based community. So you're the core drivers of volunteers into the places that need volunteers. And yet, among secular nonprofits that rely on volunteers to accomplish their social mission, 85 percent have no relationship with a faith-based organization in their community. Imagine what could happen if these mentoring organizations, these tutoring organizations, these other organizations and you are able to build and forge the kinds of relationships that we need to see. You know, there's a lot of work that's been done really in the coordination between Henry and the Office of Freedom Corps and Jay and the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, with Steve and myself. We've dramatically increased, Americorps Vista is our anti-poverty arm. In 2004, we had 315 Vista members serving in 78 faith-based sponsored organizations. Last year, we had 1,000 members serving in 828 faith-based organizations and they have generated -- (Applause) -- thank you.

They've generated and supported 600,000 community volunteers to help with these causes. We've seen other opportunities. National service participants in the Gulf Coast, we've had 93,000 of them helping out after Katrina. And those folks supported more than 260,000 community volunteers that came out to help, more than half of which were from the faith-based community. So, we're beginning to see some really powerful connections between how my organization and all of yours can work together. And I want to talk now very quickly about three things that we're announcing at this conference.

First, there are some new on-line resources at our resource center that's available at nationalservice.gov. And our goal is to make sure that every one of our state service commissions that administer Americorps grants, understands the contacts and how to work with your organizations. How

many of you know who your state, the executive director of your state service commission? It's not a good, that's not a good showing. And what it means is, that you don't have access to the nearly \$1 billion that my agency is making available through the states in terms of service and service learning and technical assistance and support. We're going to make -- we're going to have a special faith-based institute for our state service commissions when they gather here in September so that we're training them how to reach out to you. And we will follow-up with you, to make sure that you know then how to connect with them. And finally today, I want to make sure that you really understand the opportunity that you have with our Vista programs. We started a partnership with Department of Justice's Weed and Seed. Today, in 40 cities across America, we have hundreds of Vistas supporting those re-entry projects. The Vistas alone have supported 7,294 ex-offenders in making those connections and dramatically cutting the recidivism rates. And they've served more than 7,000 children of inmates.

Our Vistas and our other members are available for your organizations to tap into. We just need to get the communications better. I'm so much looking forward to working with you. I'm so glad to have had the opportunity for years to help make these movements come together. Please think of our service movement as a fellow traveler with your faith-based and community initiatives. We want to help make it work. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. MEDEFIND: All right. Is it possible to harness the ingenuity and energy that has driven American success to engage our community's most pressing needs. And the answer from everyone in this room, I'm certain, is an unequivocal yes. In fact, I would say, that social entrepreneurs -- that's the term the President likes to use -- social entrepreneurs have every bit as much intelligence and energy, ingenuity as other entrepreneurs and dare we say it, a whole lot more passion. But the challenge is that government typically cuts in the other direction. Government efforts to aid the needy typically emphasize the very large, the bureaucratic solution. They deal in bulk. When they work with social entrepreneurs, they typically either ignore them, in the first place, or when they work with them, they try to press them into the government mold and squeeze out the very things that make them entrepreneurial in the first place. And so a central focus of the initiative has been to think not only how can we focus on the entrepreneurism within communities and the individuals who are leading that, but how can we be entrepreneurial within government, to change the way that government interacts with these front-line individuals and organizations, to tap into their strengths, to build up what they're doing, to enable them to continue doing it

in a way that reflects that vision that started things in the first place. So, the panels that we're going to be having this morning are going to look at how that has happened in ways that could be replicable, not just further throughout the Federal Government, but at the state level and the local level, ways that we can pair the large very massive bulk process of government with a very small nimble solution-builders in the community.

To lead the first two panels is an individuals who has helped lead these efforts, an entrepreneur within the Federal Government, Brent Orell. Brent was the first Director of the Faith-Based and Community Initiative at the Department of Labor, which has been one of the drivers of these efforts throughout the Federal Government. He's also been a leader at the Administration for Children and Families, which as many of you know is a massive organization that's worked all throughout the country engaging the needs of low-income children and their families. And then finally, he has just very recently been appointed by President Bush to lead the nation's workforce system at the Department of Labor. And so Brent is intimately involved with these things. He has engaged them, and he will be leading the panels that will be looking at some of these innovations that have helped within government, and then are now working their way out and have worked their way out in the communities. So, Brent, please come up and the panelists for the first panel as well. And the panelists, we will not have the time we hoped for Q and A during the panels. But they will be around throughout the day and will be available for personal interactions as well. So, Brent, come on up. (Applause)

PANEL 1: ENLISTING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS FOR SERVICE DELIVERY

MR. ORELL: Good morning. Wow, those are bright lights. We're descending another level. You heard 50,000 feet yesterday, 30,000 feet this morning. Now we're descending down into the grass roots where we can really see what's going on in this country with regard to faith-based and community initiatives. As Jed just told you, my name is Brent Orell. I'm the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training at the United States Department of Labor. And it's really my pleasure to be here. Faith-Based and Community Initiatives have been a passion of mine well before the administration. I worked on Capitol Hill for about 14 years and have the honor in that context to also try to promote these ideas. And I can tell you if there's anybody out there who tries to tell you that the Faith- Based and Community Initiative has been something less than a complete success, they absolutely don't know what they're talking about. (Applause)

Yes, please applaud. I can tell you from my perspective, having seen this grow from where were in 1996 around terrible choice to where we are today, it is a world turned upside down. We have achieved so much. And you're going to get a chance to hear about some of those achievements today. Our panel this morning is enlisting, it's called Enlisting Entrepreneurs for Social Services Delivery. And it's focusing on practical and innovative ways the Federal Government has enlisted Social Entrepreneurs. We have two excellent panelists with us today, Lisa Johnson, who is the Skill Development Manager with the Missouri Department of Labor and Bruce Wilkinson, Senior Vice President for International Programs with World Vision. As Senator Lieberman talked about this morning, the idea of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives has been with us basically since the founding. Alexis de Tocqueville talked about associations and societies as early as the 1830s. I will tell you that today, when I meet with representatives and officials from other governments and our European partners in particular, when I try to talk to them about Faith-Based and Community Initiatives what I mostly get is a quizzical expression on the person's face that I'm describe it to. Because frankly, the American experience is so unique in this regard in terms of the number and types of organizations that are providing service to people in need. Faith-based and community organizations have a number of unique assets. Location.

I notice in the audience earlier that a colleague of mine, Scott Allard, who's done some wonderful work around the geographical question of where the need is and where the organizations are that are trying to meet that need. If you are in a high poverty area and are not partnering with faith-based and community organizations, the question immediately arises, who are you partnering with? Because those are the organizations in those high-need areas. They're focused on many of the same challenges as government, but have often had trouble working with government in the past. The Faith-Based and Community Initiatives is really about trying to bridge that gap, and tie up into the assets of civil society to improve how government and nonprofits address need in America. I want to give you three very quick examples before we -- of how the Federal Government has been attempting to implement this before I call up our panelist to give their stories.

I had the honor when I was the Director of the Faith-Based Office of the Department of Labor, to institute something called grass-roots grants. We created a grant program that provided small awards to small organizations, \$25,000 to \$75,000 for about 247 small faith-based and community groups, to help link those organizations to the nation's public workforce system that I now oversee. Those small grants helped to prevent many of the hardest to serve in our society, ex-offenders, chronically unemployed, single moms,

TANIF recipients, from falling through the cracks of the public workforce system. These grant sites provided job- related services. These are amazing numbers. These grantees provided services to 37,702 people over the last five years, and placed 17,894 in employment or training, and they were able to draw out 89,875 volunteer hours into DOL-funded projects. That's the power of faith-based and community organizations in both reaching the needy and helping to bring additional resources in terms of volunteers to the table.

Another example is the Access to Recovery program at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides vouchers for individuals who have substance abuse problems and allows them to access faith and community-based organizations. In Connecticut, 30 percent of the partners in Connecticut's ATR program were joining with government for the first time. That number went up to 70 percent in Louisiana. Using client surveys, the California Rural Indian Health Board learned that one-quarter of their clients accessed treatment services for the first time through ATR. The program had expanded capacity by offering new services and resources to clients with previously unmet need. Those a just a couple of examples of the wide-array of new Public/Private partnerships with faith-based and community organizations that have been developed and grown since 2001. The panelists today will provide specific examples of how their state workforce agency in Missouri and World Vision, one of the largest faith-based organizations in the world, are creating and expanding bridges between social entrepreneurs and government to more effectively meet human need.

Bruce Wilkinson, if the panelists could join us up here now, that would be great, Bruce Wilkinson is the head of a World Vision-led consortium of relief and development agencies in Zambia that includes Africare, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, the Salvation Army and Expanded Church Response. This coalition known as Rapids, has formed a network of community-based care in most of the country's providence, training and equipping volunteer care givers to serve HIV-affected households, orphans and vulnerable children. He has previously served as Senior Vice President for International Programs at World Vision in the United States and as a Regional Director for West Africa based in Senegal overseeing relief and development efforts in eight countries. Before joining World Vision, he served with USAID in Mali and the Peace Corp in Ghana.

Lisa Johnson, who I mentioned is the Skill Development Manager at Missouri Department of Economic Development, began work with the division in 2004 and is responsible for staff professional development and training statewide, as well as the oversight of several special initiatives, including the

SHARE Network, which is a DOL-sponsored program in Missouri. As the SHARE Network liaison, Lisa provides training for state team members and monitors activities statewide as the state attempts to embed DOL services in faith-based and community organizations around the state. Lisa earned a Bachelor's Degree in Business, is a Board Member for the Missouri Association of Workforce Development and a member of the National Association of Workforce Development. I'm going to have Bruce come up first and give us a few minutes on his work, and then we'll have Lisa follow that. And I'll, perhaps if we have time, we'll ask a couple questions. (Applause)

MR. WILKINSON: Good morning. And I think we're in the mode of beginning with the end in mind, right? Senator Lieberman certainly took us in that direction. Basically, I'm going to try to transport you from Washington, D.C. ballroom, to the work that we do in the Southern African Country of Zambia. Now, I'm sure all of you know exactly where Zambia is located, correct? That wasn't very resounding. (Laughter) All right. But we are, we're going to go into Zambia. And we're going to follow-up on Ambassador Diver's comments and on the President's comments. And this is a program that's been supported by the PEPFAR initiative, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS' Relief. And this has been a pandemic, if you know the statistics on HIV and AIDS, I'll just take you into Zambia for one second. The number of people who are infected out of a population of 11 million people, 1 million people are infected, are all positive. There are 1.2 million children who are orphaned. 1.2 million children out of 6 million children below the age of 18.

You were hearing some of America's challenges this morning. This is the challenge of a Zambian. This is the type of work that we've been able to mobilize faith-based and community-based organizations to actually address. And let me go a bit further. It actually resides very, very simply in getting the family or the household in Zambia, to take a look at the decisions they make, those decisions which impact seriously on whether they're going to actually thrive, turn that pandemic around, make good choices, and actually look to the future with a positive image. So, I was hoping that we were going to have a bit of imagery, is that going to be possible? It may not. And that's -- okay, there it is, thank you very much. So basically let's, next slide, and I have my -- all right here we go. But basically, what we're trying to do is, we're trying to connect. These resources the United States Government gives, and the -- and I'm going to put my glasses on so I can read -- and the technical resources with local partners initiative that enhances sustainability in the response. Because if we don't actually really meet clients' needs, we're not going to be relevant, right?

Faith-based and community contributions constitute a front- line social movement, and Zambians helping Zambians.

We just had CNN come in and do three world reports. And the last world report they did, the title of that last world report was, Zambians helping Zambians. So many times the images that you hear coming out of Africa are negative images. I'm here to tell you that we have - - the next slide please -- we have 15,000, 15,000 what we call care givers who are volunteers, who go to five households as their remit, and go and help grandmoms who are taking care of orphans, going to help people who are chronically ill, going to help the youth to try to help the youth to make choices that will lead to a better life. We take care of over 230,000 orphan children in Zambia through that network. We take care of 51,000 people living with HIV and AIDS and about 60-some thousand youth. Next slide please. These care givers are absolutely wonderful people. They are brilliant. They are mostly driven out of, their choice comes out of faith-based organizations; 80 percent of them belong to a faith-based organization, and they say, I would like to help. I'd like to help in my community. But what we're tying into here is a social movement and any social entrepreneur looks for that unique piece of the society and then connects with the energy of that society. That's what you're all here doing, right? You're connecting with the energy that's resident in your community to transform that community, and then you come in and equip it, train it, and organize that energy to move that energy forward so that it really meets the needs of the people.

These care givers constitute a social movement. In Zambia, this has been going on for centuries, for decades. We have people who always wanted to help their neighbor, they wanted to help their relative, they wanted to help their community member. All we did was say look, we really at this time, the family is so stressed in Zambia because we have so many children who are orphaned, we have so many people who are chronically ill, the family is over-burdened with trying to take care of that load. So, we said to the care giver, can you go and put your arm, put your arm round those people at that household level, so that five households are chosen, and guess what, the households choose the care givers that they would like to have come visit them, very much a decision-based out- of-the-household. We say, here are the care givers, who would you like to come and work with you at your household? Literally, these care givers are the hands of God. Next slide please.

These are the consortium members again. When you work with partners, great organizations, these are all great organizations that we worked with in Zambia, plus, next slide please, we work with 181 -- you won't be able to read that. Well, actually you might on, you might on this screen. But we work with 181

faith-based and community-based organizations where we give sub-grants or small grants to. And you can see by the list, that there's a lot of faith-based and community-based organizations. These are very, usually small organizations that we work with. But then we also work, these care givers are also part of faith communities in Zambia. And that's where we draw the next slide, please. So what are we looking at here? We've then taken that energizing relationship of care givers, Zambians helping Zambians, and we say, Other partners, come and join us. What this does to American corporations, to American foundations is, what it does is it inspires them. It inspires them to come and be part of something that's larger than we all could imagine in the beginning. It's something that we found incredibly, you give the on- ramp, create the value proposition to the corporations to the foundations, and they will come and join. Yes, in Zambia. Yes, on HIV and AIDS.

Normally, Zambia and HIV and AIDS is some of the most distant things from their minds. What do we know, how could we get involved with HIV and AIDS work in Africa? No. Soon as you create the value proposition and give them an on-ramp, a concrete place where they can make a difference, Shram Corporation World Bicycle Relief. They're providing bicycles, or mobility, to all of our care givers in Zambia, 23,000 bicycles we're producing. We're producing a quality bicycle as well. We're transforming the bicycle market at the same time that we're providing care givers with mobility to go and see their clients. We've got the Global Business Coalition and the President's Malaria Initiative. We distributed 485,000 insecticide treated bed nets, basically sleeping under a net to protect yourself from malaria. That covered 11 percent of the population in Zambia, and we did it in three months. Why? Because Global Business Coalition brought together corporate partners, the U.S. Government said we'd match that contribution and now we have the most vulnerable populations who are HIV positive with their immune systems which are compromised, sleeping under bed nets. They are the most susceptible to contracting malaria and now they're avoiding malaria, especially the children. We've also got church and corporate partners providing over 30,000 care kits. These are care kits put together, probably some of you participated in the World Vision build of a care kit. It's basically putting together a kit in your church basement, or in a civic center, or at a corporate headquarters, and then those kits are put in a container and they go directly from the person who put it together with a nice handwritten note, directly to the care giver in Zambia. From your hands to their hands, so they can go and do their work, which has essential supplies for taking care of the health needs of the communities and the households that they go and serve. And then also, we've had the Zambian government provided us a beautiful facility for a warehouse and now we're bringing in over \$25 million of in-

kind contributions from the corporate sector every year, coming into Zambia to meet the health needs, the educational needs.

We just had Pearson Books give us what was it, 12 containers of K-12 textbooks, absolutely brilliant. This really makes a difference for people. Hasbro Corporation has been incredible. They've actually supplied the trucks for our distribution center, and they just said, Look -- I got a phone call the other day -- they said, Bruce, what do you need. Not what we have in excess inventory, but what do you need. I said I need dolls. We have so many children who loose their parents, we need these dolls where they can actually hold onto something. Hasbro went and made 40,000 black dolls, beautiful black dolls for these children in Zambia. (Applause)

Next slide please. Again, it's about leverage as well. We're leveraging those volunteers. We have those volunteers contributing 360,000 days. Not -- we're not counting in hours in Africa, friends. We count by days, 360,000 days a year of volunteer service to their communities. We have a 96 percent retention rate of a volunteer workforce. I know. I told my M&E guys, I said -- go back. I said, I don't believe you. Go back to the field. And I did five random tests to test those numbers. They went back and they came back with a 97 percent number. Okay. I get it. All right, you see what the leverage can do though, in financial resources. Private resources, the government resources, \$57 million for this program over five years. We've taken those numbers and actually turned that into a \$220 million program. So the U.S. Government investment of \$57 million has produced another \$115 million in terms of asset that goes into the communities in Zambia. It's an amazing partnership. And you can bring people together if you have the right focus. Stay focused on your clients, stay focused on what the need is, and be relevant to that community's need, those households' needs. Next slide.

I'd like to thank you and say that it's a privilege of working and I want you to know, that you are welcome to come, and once you figure out where Zambia is, you are welcome. You are welcome to come and see because we hear a lot about America, but I want you to know that Africa and Zambians, they themselves are providing the solution for their own crisis, which is HIV and AIDS and that it is a volunteer workforce of 15,000 care givers. God Bless. (Applause)

MS. JOHNSON: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MS. JOHNSON: It's truly an honor to be here with you today. Greetings from Missouri. My name is Lisa Johnson, and as the Skill Development Manager with the Missouri Division of Workforce Development, one of my projects that I oversee is the Missouri SHARE Network Initiative. Some of you are probably asking, what exactly is a SHARE Network? Under the President's Faith-Based and Community Initiative, the U.S. Department of Labor provides support for state workforce system leadership. And in Missouri, the sharing how access to resources and powers, or SHARE Network Initiative strives to create additional points of contacts for individuals that may not know about or have access to Missouri one-stop career centers. This effort captures the commitment of grassroots faith-based and community organizations through a new workforce system partnerships.

SHARE Network has two components that allow for the high tech and high touch approach to providing access to career assistance and human services. The first is the SHARE Network on-line resource directory which provides customers access to organizations offering more than 100 different human services delivered through government agencies and faith-based and community organizations. The second component consists of SHARE Network Access Points, or SNAPs, located in local neighborhoods and communities, where trained volunteers assist individuals with employment services. Missouri SHARE Network Initiative includes partnerships with the Department of Economic Development Division of Workforce Development, local investment boards, and a variety of faith-based and community organizations.

Through these partnerships, agencies work together to enhance the effectiveness of Missouri's workforce system. Missouri has three over-arching share network objectives. The first objective is to grant universal access to workforce system services for clients of faith-based and community organizations who traditionally would not be able to utilize our services. The second objective is to increase the number of faith-based and community organizations that are actively committee partners in the workforce system, and therefore, increase the network of resources that are offered. The third objective is to identify, showcase and replicate innovative faith-based and community organizational movements in Missouri's workforce system. SHARE Network requires local team efforts.

As with any project of this magnitude, regional and local buy-in and participation is absolutely critical. Of Missouri's 14 workforce investment boards, 12 have entered into agreement with the Division of Workforce Development to conduct local outreach, populate the SHARE Network On-line Resource

Director, establish faith- based and community partnerships and open at least two regional access points each before June 2008. Each workforce region selected representatives for the state SHARE Network team. And the work of these local team members really help make SHARE Network the success that it is in Missouri. These dedicated individuals are the ones making those outreach calls and visits to the faith-based and community organizations that they know to be the backbone of the communities in the neighborhoods.

This concentration on that relationship building has really proved invaluable in the development of FBCO partnerships in Missouri. With 42 career centers statewide, there's so many areas where people many areas where people may have to drive up to 100 miles to be able to conduct a job search activity. This is just one of the needs that drives Missouri's SHARE Network team to continually seek out local organizations that are already providing wonderful human services and asking them to join in the workforce development efforts. Missouri has established successful SHARE Network access points in a variety of locations. These includes Salvation Army, Adult Vocational Service Centers, local congregations, local libraries, transitional housing facilities, substance abuse centers, homeless shelters, community action agencies, food pantries, housing centers and neighborhood centers. Access points are a great asset for Missouri's Workforce System. Establishing these access points is a low-cost and viable way to provide workforce services in established and trusted local organizations with which people are familiar. Utilizing volunteers in faith- based and community organizations where people already access other services, access points provide a familiar face and nonthreatening environment for people in need. The Missouri SHARE Network Initiative has seen positive results in the following areas: Enhanced Public/Private partnerships, improved service and increased access to services. Taking a look at the numbers, more that 6500 resource providers are members of the on-line resource directory. More than 9700 services are offered by members in the resource directory.

Recently, we discovered that 1271 official referrals have been made through the resource directory to service providers. Within access points we're proud to say that we have surpassed the goal of 14 access points. We have opened 41 access points throughout the state. (Applause)

Thank you. Additionally, 20 access points are soon to open in the coming weeks. Since October 2007, more than 1500 customers have been served in access points statewide, and of those, 852 are first-time visitors, 730 are those returning folks. SHARE Network has had a powerful impact and proven beneficial to Missouri communities. I want to share a couple of stories with you. Access points in the towns

of Marshfield and Seymour opened within days of a manufacturing plant closing. Both locations were able to provide easy access to job search assistance, for the more than 100 workers who lost their jobs. Travel to libraries close to home help them job search during financially challenging weeks. Additionally, services made available by resource directory members, provided short term assistance.

In the Marshfield library access point, we also had discovered there were volunteers with special skills and abilities who were able to assist people. As an example, one librarian who knows sign language was able to help a hearing-impaired person register in our job- matching system called Missouri Career Source. And as a result, word spread, and the librarian now on a regular basis, assists several hearing-impaired persons. These access points consistently also refer job seekers to career centers and other service providers for more specialized services.

I also want to tell you about the rural communities surrounding the popular family vacation destination of Branson, Missouri. It's been wonderful to see how seamlessly SHARE Network really blends into what's happening already in Stone and Taney Counties. In Stone County, Christian associates actively assist people who need things like emergency shelter and counseling in domestic violence situations, transitional housing for people who need to get back on their feet, a thrift store to provide clothing for work, and one-on-one counseling assistance. SHARE Network provides that natural compliment by adding access to job searching as a valuable and vital resource to this organization. In Taney County, Church Army is a transitional center for people recovering from drug and alcohol addictions. Many people come from all over the state to this area. Before clients are released to go home, they conduct job searches using Missouri's Career Source, and locate service providers in their home neighborhood using the SHARE Network Resource Director.

Near Houston, Missouri, in a remote area, where the Texas County Food Pantry stands, people are also reaping the benefits of SHARE Network. These customers receiving already some of the ten existing services are not assisted with job search activities as an initial first step to gaining employment. Volunteers assist customers by utilizing Missouri Career Source, providing local newspapers and job postings. This really integrates well into their human service offerings and volunteers say it's just actually become just part of the process of serving people. The Pantry not only refers people to potential employers, but also follows up through customer interviews and seeks out employment opportunities by contacting employers about potential job openings. SHARE Network Access point volunteers are the ones who provide a tremendous service to the citizens of their area. For a small rural area with an unemployment rate

of 5.4 percent, the Pantry is definitely making a positive impact. Last month, they had a 60 percent job placement rate. (Applause)

For Missouri as a whole, it is a sign of success when we can say that people visiting those food pantries leave not only with food staples, but also a referral to a job in their hand. This is what SHARE Network is really about. We've learned some lessons. I want to share those with you in closing. Access points sustainability is absolutely critical in the components for success.

Even the most promising partnerships may struggle for long-term effectiveness without the capacity to incorporate workforce services as an add-on to the human services the organizations already provide. If faith-based and community organizations are going a good job providing their human services, people in the community know, that's the place to go. It's a great place to start when looking for potential partnerships. And in Missouri, we want to tap into the success of those organizations and incorporate the high tech and high touch components of SHARE Network. SHARE Network is not simply about getting people a job. It's ultimately about helping people learn to job search, seek out resources to overcome barriers to employment and job retention, and underemployment.

This empowers people and it creates those life skills that can not only serve them now, but provide for a lifetime of success. Missouri's Division of Workforce Development believes in SHARE Network, and we're proud to be a participating state. In Missouri, SHARE Network just makes sense for us. It's cost-effective, it enhances faith-based and community partnerships. It's the right thing to do, it's from the heart and it works. Efforts like SHARE Network would not be possible without the many people who give of their time and talents to effect change, touch lives, and give to people in need. I want to thank you for your dedication to service and organizations like those we partner with in Missouri. And thank you for allowing me to share with you Missouri's Workforce Development Faith-Based and Community Initiative SHARE Network. (Applause)

MR. ORELL: Thank you both very much. I know that we're running behind, but I am going to exercise the prerogative of chair to ask one question, which I think is really important. We've heard a lot about how great faith-based and community organizations are. And I think is we polled this audience, we'd find very little disagreement with that proposition. But what I would like to know from a practitioner's standpoint, what do you think is the principal challenge or challenges involved in working with grassroots, faith and community-

based organizations? And how can the organizations represented here in this room better prepare themselves to partner with you?

MS. JOHNSON: We hear this over and over and over when we go out into the communities in Missouri. And we ask them, What is it that you need from us to help in these partnerships? And the resounding response from people over and over and over in faith-based and community organizations in Missouri is, we need to figure out how we can do more with less. We need to figure out how we can tap into resources that are available at the national and state level. Things like, grant monies, that's one of the things that we are charged with at the state level, is being able to locate, do a little research and through information that we're gathering in places like here in Washington, D.C., for the last two days, we're able to share that information really with the grassroots organizations who in cases may mean that it is in for instance, in Seligman, Missouri, which is just a couple of miles north of Pea Ridge, Arkansas. It's a small community. I was there last week. And with their grand opening for their access point, they told me, We had a selfsupporting food pantry. There was a wonderful lady in our community who was always there. And if the food pantry ran a little short one month, she would make up the difference. That was her service to that community. She passed away last year, and it was her daughter who actually was leading the SHARE Network Initiative in this community talking to me. And she said, You know, in my condition, in my situation with children to raise and health concerns, I can't do what my mother did. I can staff, but I can't make up the difference. And we really need a way to figure out how we can provide services in the food pantry. We have the volunteers, but we need a way to provide the resources themselves. Things like that that we're constantly hearing.

And we were very blessed to be able to receive a grant so that we could provide training at no cost to faith and community-based organizations who were involved with SHARE Network and also those from the community who were just interested in knowing more about SHARE Network and partnering with the state, so that in July and August, we'll actually be offering some free training to these folks to help bring them up, teaching them how to find resources and then apply for grants. We don't have a pot of money, if you will, with the state, so we're getting creative ourselves in trying to figure out ways that we can actually help support them. And I think at the heart of it, offering as much as we can and offering of ourselves has really made a big difference in the commitment that volunteers have made. (Applause)

MR. WILKINSON: Brent, we just had a workshop yesterday, sort of addressing that question. And it is a large question. Our experience in Africa and Zambia is two- fold. One, I think we really need to know who our volunteers or who the people are that actually are being mobilized to do this work. And so we did some operations research on our 15,000 care givers, understand their motivations, understand their own circumstances in their own economic empowerment so they can contribute more in terms of what they're doing in terms of service to their community. So that was very important information and there's a lot of digesting of that information and actually influencing policy decisions as well as sort of practical outcomes. I think the other part of this is, as you engage more and more and you before more and more sophisticated, I won't use the word professionalized, because we know that's not a good word any longer, but as you increase the sophistication, let's say you do access some grants and you do access some resources and you actually start to build. It is so very important, every one of our organizations, those 181 smaller organizations, we provide what we call capacity-building training in finance and compliance, and then we take them into the programmatic world, and really work with them in honing their skills in the programmatic side, which could be orphan care, it could be caring for people living positively with HIV and AIDS in terms of the messaging that goes to youth.

You again, have to help those organizations in their organizational development to grow along with the type of role that they're evolving towards. If they ever feel they're out of step with that, then you witness, start to see them either create tension within their organizations because they loose the focus on their mission, because now it's about money, it's about program, it's about, you know, it's all the stuff. Right? It's the activities. And if you don't go in at an early stage and really, really, root that mission deeply within the hearts and minds of the people, and you say, yes, it must be already there. It is, but they don't articulate it necessarily very well and repeat that articulation of their mission. So they have to keep mission- central, even as they grow and develop as an organization and supply the tools that they need in that organizational development. Get behind them. Work with them. And watch them grow and celebrate friends, and celebrate those successes. Celebration, not appreciation takes these organizations to a whole other level of what they believed they could do. So, thanks. (Applause)

MR. ORELL: I want to thank you both for your time this morning sharing your insights and experience and your heart and your vision for service to the poor, both here in America and abroad. And we'll move on now to our next panel.

PANEL 2: EXTENDING THE WORK OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

MR. ORELL: Our second panel this morning is entitled, Extending the Work of Social Entrepreneurs. And the intent of this panel is to highlight creative and, the creative and innovative work that the panelists have engaged in in building the capacity of local entrepreneurs in their own communities and across the U.S. at the community level. Our panelists are Danny Cortes, Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff of Esperanza USA, Governor Scott McCallum, CEO of Aidmatrix, and Fred Davie, who is President of Public/Private Ventures. The first panel looked at approaches to building links. And you heard that a lot in both presentations, but building links or mission intersection between government and social entrepreneurs. This second panel will be looking at more specifically at the question, of how to develop more effective social entrepreneurs.

My own view is that there's a central fallacy that's sort of present about his initiative that somehow it's an argument between who's better between faith and secular organizations or between large organizations and small organizations or between new organizations and more established or older organizations. I think this initiative is about integrating all of these different kinds of organizations. Because each of them brings different strengths and each of them has different weaknesses. But together, they can provide a holistic picture of how to serve needy individuals and families in this country. Faith-based and community organizations often possess unique assets that compliment government services. They're located in communities of need. They have connections to community leaders and access to volunteers and holistic services. Some of these organizations do lack experience working with government, adequate case management and evaluation systems, and long term sustainability plans.

A core tenant of the Faith-Based and Community Initiative is to provide the capacity-building necessary to ensure that public good has been achieved through strengthening social entrepreneurs. And I'm going to give you a couple of examples of how the Federal Government has participated in building that capacity. Many of you have heard of the Compassion Capital Fund, which is out of the Department of Health and Human Services. And it was within the agency that I helped lead just before coming back to the Department of Labor. The Administration for Children and Families has evaluated CCF, which provides both grants and technical assistance to grassroots, faith-based and community organizations. More than 72 percent of those who responded to the survey on the CCF program, the organizations who had actually

participated, reported that the CCF funds had increased overall organizational development, improved the level and quality of services and developed improved community linkages and partnerships as well as leadership and governments. Two-thirds of the respondents reported that CCF funds enable them to serve more clients and 86 percent were able to sustain the increase after the CCF funds were exhausted. And finally, 64 percent of respondents reported improvements in seeking or diversifying public and private funding. The Compassion Capital Fund is just one example of the Government's effort to strengthen, pardon me, strengthen social entrepreneurs since 2001.

Our panelists today will provide specific examples of building up the capacity of social entrepreneurs through their leadership at Esperanza, the Aidmatrix Foundation and the Public/Private Ventures. If I could have the panelists come forward now.

The first one is the Rev. Danny Cortes, who serves as Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff of Esperanza, the largest Hispanic, faith-based and community development corporation in the United States. Esperanza's cornerstone initiative is a six-state Hispanic capacity project, funded through the Compassion Capital Fund. This project provides capacity building, technical assistance and small grants to Hispanic communities across the country. Esperanza also received a three year grant from the Department of Labor to launch Esperanza Trabajo, or Hope is Working. That project worked with Latino at-risk and adjudicated youth in nine cities to turn unemployment, aimless and troubled futures into career-oriented lifetime employment, fulfillment and success. Rev. Cortez is a member of a number of boards and ministries, and was pastor of the first Spanish Baptist of Philadelphia for ten years.

Our second speaker is Governor Scott McCallum, who has more than 30 years of executive experience leading cross- functional divisions, including operations planning, supply management, media and public relations, marketing and development, government relations and strategic partnerships. He served as Governor of Wisconsin with a career spanning more than a decade in public service in office. Governor McCallum acts as president and CEO of Aidmatrix Foundation, a nonprofit that uses advanced information technology to create efficiencies between donors and those in need. As CEO, he has grown Aidmatrix Foundation to globally transact \$1.5 billion annually, with six operations in six continents, with operations in six continents to 35,000 nonprofits.

And finally, Fred Davie, president of Public/Private Ventures. Fred joined P/PV in 2001 and was appointed president and CEO in November of 2005 and assumed that position June 2006. Fred brings a wealth of knowledge and public and private sector experience, a deep knowledge of community

development and organizing, housing and youth employment issues and a strong commitment to improving the nation's social policies. In addition, I can tell you that he has been one of our best partners on the prisoner re-entry initiatives that the Department of Labor launched and has provided just invaluable leadership to that effort. So, I would like to have Rev. Cortez come up and get us started and tell us a little bit about the work of Esperanza and helping to build the capacity of faith and community-based groups. (Applause)

REV. CORTEZ: Good morning. (Whereupon, Rev. Cortez addressed the audience in Spanish) That's a pretty good crowd, I'm glad to see that. How's everybody today? I got ten minutes and I'm going to use a few of them just to kind of mess around up here so that -- (Laughter) No. I bring you greetings from Rev. Luis Cortes, the president of an organization. He is, this past week, we just finished our National Hispanic Prayer Breakfast and Conference. I've been in the city for five days. So, if I look a worn and a little haggard, you know why. I got up yesterday at 4:30 in the morning, and I went to bed at 9:00. And then I got up -- actually, that's a lie. I went to bed at 11:00, because I was getting ready for this. No. But I'm glad to be here. And I think it's important to celebrate the successes of the work of the Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Our organization Esperanza is a nonprofit community development corporation of -- in the City of Philadelphia. Our mission statement is very clear: Driven by the biblical mandate to serve and advocate for the least of these, we strengthen Hispanic communities. It's based on Matthew 25:40. That's what we do. We do that locally, we do that nationally. And if you really want to know a lot about who we are, go to www.esparanza.us and you can learn all about it. I won't take a lot more time to talk about that, because that's not really why you're here, correct? All you really want to know is what we did and how it relates to increasing the capacity of nonprofits to be about the work to which they feel called.

And I want to share just three very basic things about that, which I think are important. And we want to get into the work of helping who have some conviction. To use the President's terminology, the Armies of Compassion in order to be effective, sometimes need some tools, yes? And in the work that we did with 350 nonprofits across the country over the last eight years, some of which were through the Hispanic Capacity Project, some with the Department of Labor project, some things that we've done on our own, without federal funding. Amen, sustainability. Anyway, we'll leave that alone. This is what we've learned. That somebody has to do something -- is there a timer around here somewhere. You know, I'm so small, I can't see that. (Laughter)

This is going to work out really well. We learn that there's a role to be played fo intermediaries in helping small emergent nonprofits interface with various sectors. And what are those sectors? Well, the first sector is the Federal Government. When we first got our grant, we got a grant from ACF which was a part of OCS, which was a part of, I can't even remember the other acronyms. And every time we would get a letter, we would sit in our office and try to figure out, just who sent this to us? (Laughter)

There's a role to be played in helping organizations that are young and emergent, nascent, developing, have a sense of who they are and what they want to be about, but haven't quite figured it all out. There's a role to be played in helping these organizations understand the sectors with which they have to interface if they're going to be effective. One of those sectors is obviously the government's sector, whether it's a national government sector, whether it's a state government, whether it's the local government. They all have their games. They all have their rules. They all have their little boxes and whistles and things you've got to jump in and out of in order to be about the work to which you've been called. So one of the things we learned very fast was when you bring in new organizations, you've got to help them understand the world in which they live. And not only the government sector, but the broader independent sector. Because a nonprofit world is about what if you want to be effective? Finding the resources to be about that to which you've been called. Amen?

REV. CORTES: I know I'm not in church, but I'm a minister, so.(Applause) So it becomes imperative -- oh, man, I've got plenty of time -- that you know the sectors in which you work. The independent sector, the brother nonprofit sector. We also learn that those intermediaries have a key role to play in helping organizations understand questions of governance of and legal structure and how they should relate to the mission to which they've been called if they've been birthed by something or someone. What do they got to do in order to be able to honor the birth or at the same time that they honor the nonprofit that's emerging and becoming. And if you don't work hard at integrating those questions, then often you find yourselves in trouble. And I think the gentleman from World Vision alluded to that in his comments. Fifty-two percent of the organizations we worked with ended up having a nonprofit status, a 501(c)(3). But we found that 15 percent refused to get incorporated because they became clear as a result of our intervention with them, that they didn't have to get incorporated. They were happy not going after public monies and doing the work that God had called them the way they had called them, and they didn't want to integrate or get into the whole question of public support for God's work.

Now, we didn't only work with religious groups, we work with other groups as well. I don't want to give the impression that we were only working with faith-based organizations. But 15 percent of the groups that didn't get incorporated were in fact faith-based organizations that didn't want to have anything to do with that stuff. But they came to that understanding as a result of the services that a capacity building initiative affords them. There's another thing that emerged. And not only, what you call it, helping to interpret realities, it was also important to understand the role and the relationship of language to the development of capacity. And in two ways. The language of instruction is equally important to the content of instruction. And people don't know if they understand that when you're working with young groups who are emerging who often are in -- I asked the question about Spanish because half of you didn't know what I was saying, right? Or, maybe 70 percent of you didn't know what I was saying, or maybe 80 percent. It would be impossible to learn the reality of the language of capacity building and development if you can't understand it. When we worked in the Yakima Valley, and I don't know if I said that right, because I've been corrected in the past, in the Yakima Valley -- whew, one minute -- okay, we ended up having to spend a lot of time working with immigrant communities who didn't understand the language of capacity. But we had to do it in their own language at the same time that we taught them the nomenclature of capacity building. Because the nomenclature, the language of capacity in itself is a technical assistance process, engaging the content, engage the matter, discussing boards, discussing governance, discussing legal structures, discussing all these terms, which is part of the profession of capacity building. Let's not be mysterious about it. It's a profession. And all of us, you know, have to deal with that reality. In order to do that well, people have to engage language both in the language with which they have comfort, the tongue, their mother tongue, but also in the sense of the language of helping me understanding. And there will be clearly some tools and organizational assessments through a capacity building plan, and some other things, which in the process of deploying, people then begin to ask the question and learn.

And what's the last thing I want to say to you in my two seconds? Sorry, you can't buy me that coffee. Somebody made me a bet that I wouldn't be able to do it, and I lost. The last thing I'll say is that, when you're learning capacity any time, when you're becoming an organization, when you're going there, you need time. And I wanted to thank the Faith-Based Office because a few years ago, they actually went from a one- year, 18-month grant to a three-year grand for the capacity building work. And I have to tell you why that's important. We found that it takes three to six months for people to wrap their mind around language and concepts. And then it takes another couple of months or another year or so to start taking

those concepts and saying to yourself, what am I going to do with them? How am I going to deploy them? What does it mean for me? How does it change who I am? How does it make me interface with my leadership and how to answer the questions that they might be asking relative to the issue. And you know what's the most important thing, that that process of learning produces only positive outcomes at the end of the second and third year. So if you've got a grant that's a short-term grant, the reality is, you're only going to be able to do so much with it. Because it takes you time to learn with the concepts of capacity. And what we found with the first ACP grant, was that at the end of the second and towards the, and into the third year, was that people could take the learning and actually deploy it and leverage it for dollars. And we had a \$10 to \$1 return on every grant that we made in the Hispanic Capacity Project, when people had the time to learn (Applause)

So learning is about time. So those are my three points. And since I've gone one minute and 35 seconds over, I'm going to stop right here. Thank you very much. (Applause)

GOVERNOR MCCALLUM: How come mine says I'm already one minute and 35 seconds into my talk? (Laughter) Actually, Lisa on the previous from Missouri, can give a very nice prelude when the question came up, and she said the number one charge is to do more with less. And if there's anything that Aidmatrix tries to do in working with other organizations, is to allow you to do more with less or to do things more efficiently in tying your relationship with your donors in getting the right aid to the right people at the right time. Now, I'm going to start -- we've got some slides. I was actually going to start with a video and I did that, I notice that used politicians tend to talk longer than they're supposed to. And if we do slides and videos we make sure we in time. But I think they already looked at the slides and cut the video out, so I'll just refer you to our website of aidmatrix.org.

It was actually a news story which will encapsulate what we usually say in 50 minutes to a two-minute story on Aidmatrix, and it was specifically on the work that's being done following the floods in Indiana right now. Our job is to extend or to magnify the good work that you are doing. We have tremendous work being done by many, many organizations throughout this country. And it's to unleash the power and the work that you are doing, using modern tools that is our mission. It was mentioned in the intro, we're an international nonprofit that was sponsored by some of the world's leading technology organizations, being able to take the technology, state of the art technology, to the humanitarian sector.

Our social impact is \$1-1/2 billion in aid is process annually for organizations. We've got over 35,000 recipient organizations, six continents and they continue to grow very rapidly. We can go to the next slide.

I'm going to very quickly just touch. And we've got some areas, but I constantly remind people I think the biggest thing that can be done with modern tools is something none of us have thought of yet. But some of the thing we are working on now. And I was asked to talk a little bit more on disaster. But I'll give some of the other areas, because those that are hungry face a disaster every day. Aidmatrix presently provides the technology of which 95 percent of charitable food in the U.S. goes through. And I don't think a lot of people realize that. I mean, we're almost the Intel within the operations of many of the organizations. Aidmatrix technology is linked into companies like Kraft, Kellogg, ConAgra, Coca Cola, Sunkist, Olive Garden, major food donating companies that can now go on their own website, instead of making the phone calls the faxes, what they used to have to do, as we say old technology is Excel spreadsheet and email. They can now go onto their website, enter what they're going to do. When they press donate, immediately 220 food banks in the United States see what is being offered every hour. In fact, by the time this panel is done -- (Applause)

By the time this panel is done, over a million pounds of food will have gone through our system connecting to the food banks. And I say it-- I'm going to divert a little bit. Because one of the things that people don't understanding and I think those particularly in faith-based organizations will understand, that supply can meet need. It's a principle of supply meeting need if we use the right tools and are able to do so. As we're doing work in Mexico, I quite often get, American will say, well, that's great. Let's send food down to Mexico. Many people don't realize there's more food than they need to feed people in Mexico. But it goes to waste. It's the logistics and the transportation, that type of a system we need to match the surplus, to match what is going to waste that -- with those that are hungry.

Next slide I will very quickly show we're also in medical relief exchange. We match medical product with organizations to allow them to do work better. Fascinating. I'll get into this a little bit because one of the organizations we work with, the National Association of Free Clinics. We've got 300 free clinics -- and many of these are just, you know, open part time. It turns out, the cost of medical care, the cost of the products for the indigent, for free clinics, is higher than the big hospital chain around the corner. They can't leverage the price down and don't have the tools to do that. Because they're now collaborating, working together through technology, the Aidmatrix system, we've created a market, the bottom of the pyramid, that they talk about in the business books now, where there are a number of medical companies not only donating, but

offering product that they -- in diabetic supplies, it had been up to \$45 for some of the strips that clinics were paying for. The price is now \$11 for them. They tell us the first year alone on this system, nationally in diabetic purchases alone, our free clinics are going to save over \$14 million through the use of technology. (Applause)

I was asked to speak on technology. Technology, there is a national system now, a national donations management program which links together the private sector. When we're talking about -- the Reverend's talking about languages. And language differences. And we do work with a disaster area, we just signed up another consortium which is 63 more countries that are going to be going on to the system. And they said, can you do this in different languages? I said, well, you've got to understand. In America, we've got a tougher job than that. We've got private sector, government, and nonprofit. And those languages are much more different than many romantic languages you have in Europe of understanding.

We can go to the next slide, and the one after that since I was already talking this. These are the number of states that are in the Aidmatrix network now. In fact, two of them came out since then. This has all happened within one year of an announcement of the Aidmatrix network. So these are the states that have officially signed up, as well as FEMA program at the top, with private sector support. The states must sign up individually. You may wonder why some of the states are on. lowa, Indiana, go to the state website right now, Iowa is storms2008.iowa.gov, and donate product, volunteer or cash. The organizations that, the umbrella organizations are all linked together with the state under one site, umbrella site. So this is all combined. Indiana, again, with the flooding, is why Indiana is in the system. Minnesota, a bridge went down last year. Iowa, I would venture to day that particularly with some of the support we're getting nationally, that within the next three months, all but ten states will be part of the collaborative network of one- stop work for, as we can see, with the next slide, of donors being able to donate product, transportation, under the sponsorship with UPS, services or volunteer time, or financial support. And as many of you know, the financial support is key. Part of this system is to educate donors to drive them toward cash contributions as opposed to products itself. Now add from this slide, not only can recipients request, but a new feature that wasn't going to be ready until November, but we've rushed in, lowa's asked for it in this disaster, is the nonprofits that are on the system can put in their needs. And the needs go up so the business community can see exactly what is needed in the field on the spot. We also have the warehousing tied in, so it's in anywhere in the warehousing, the system will search it out, find where it is, and get it to that organization.

Next slide. Just very quickly shows that your organization, in this case, FEMA has the ability to bring up information on real time how much has been offered. You can slice and dice it. Here's what we have in construction materials. Here's what has moved through the system in the food area. And the final slide, and we can even skip it. With this one, we get the right aid to the right people at the right time. A couple of key points, I had something that every CEO dreams of. Just yesterday, I had -- it was one of the cabinet secretaries, give the directive, and they said, they wanted us to come in, they said, McCallum, you tell us what your vision. Tell us what you really think ought to be done with this, and secondly tell us what it will cost. Now, I know every CEO thinking, sitting here, and everybody who works in nonprofits thinks, this is the most wonderful thing. And I did share that the most perfect thing we could do is build this down to the 32,000 counties in the country and a lot of this is on-going as a system. But unfortunately when I was done with that, they said, well, now tell us your short-term vision, the smaller step. I will say, to me, the next important step with this, something that's extremely important, is making sure that faith-based organizations are part of this national network. We can't have a disaster where some of the groups, where some -- and they're wonderful organizations, some come in, they do their job, and they leave. But the day-to-day work in helping people become educated, in feeding them, in improving their lives in society, comes from the organizations in the communities. And it is that type of collaboration that we must have to move ahead in our communities and in the country. This will strengthen your relationship to your donors. The system in working smarter with technology it is requiring, a downside, it requires a collaborative work in our communities. And with that collaboration, not only does your organization come out ahead, society comes out ahead. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. DAVIE: Thank you. As Brent said, I'm Fred Davie. I'm the President of Public/Private Ventures. Just a quick work about P/PV and then I'll dive into the presentation. We've been around for 30 years. Actually, we were founded by the Ford Foundation and by the Department of Labor. Primarily a youth employment programs, but today, we've evolved into an action-based research and evaluation organization that focuses on research, innovation and replication. We do work in primarily four areas. A lot of work on what makes a quality after school time. We focus a good deal on workforce development. We look a lot at criminal justice and the issue of re- entry. And then finally, we're doing some exploratory work in community health. Our services are research and evaluation. We do information dissemination and promulgation and then replication, replicating those things that work.

I see that we have my Power Point. I was told, I thought last night that we weren't going to have it, but I see it's here. So, I'll just go through it. There's no way actually to make this very sexy. I mean, it's pretty straightforward stuff. Before I start though, let me just say this. Mainly what this is about, is how to both sustain and take to scale the work that social entrepreneurs do in community. And in order to do that, there have to be some basic things that we believe are in place. A quick story. When we started the Ready for Work project, which is a big national demonstration project around prisoner re-entry, with faith and community- based organizations, it was funded by the Department of Labor. One of the first organizations we visited, we sent in a team to take a look at the accounting systems of the organization. And I got a call and the consultant we sent in said, Fred, you're not going to believe this, but this particular executive director has in the last six months drawn \$70,000 from ATM, and we're not -- from the ATM. And we're not sure what happened with it. So, I called the person up because I knew them and I said, you know, we really need to sit down and talk about this and understand what it means. And so I took a group in, and we -when we came in, he came in after we came into the room, and he was really angry. I mean, just really upset. And he had two grocery bags. And he threw them on the floor in front of us and he says, you want your ATM receipts, here they are. And to his credit, he had on the back of every one of those ATM receipts, what he had used them for, which was primarily to pay people to do small jobs around the nonprofit. That, however, would not fly if I had to go to the Labor Department and say, Here's the reporting from this nonprofit to you. So, that's basically what we're trying to fix. So, let me just go through this quickly.

We begin with Public/Private Ventures begins our support for sustainability and scale right at site selection for these sort of major projects that we do. Generally contracting with the government or with the major foundations to do this work. So, we use a detailed site assessment tool to gauge an organization's programmatic and organizational strengths and weaknesses. And we do a thorough, sort of existing, review of existing programs. We look at program management, and we look at overall goals and outcomes for a particular organization. As I said, we look at the finances and administration. And that's our ways of sort of entertaining in some cases a review. Lots of creativity when it comes to financial management in many organizations. We try to assess internal controls and systems, and we make recommendations for addressing these weaknesses both before and as a new program is being implemented.

On the next slide, we also invest considerable amount of time in organizational development. We develop a rigorous, what we call, MIS, just a management information system for data management, for site monitoring and program improvement. We do early implementation evaluation, we call it, program

implementation evaluation. So that as an organization is rolling out a program, we're going to know, right down to the last detail, what in that program in the early stages is working, what's not working and how you fix it, how you move it forward. We support with ongoing feedback on whether or not there's compliance with data collection and the research efforts that have been established for the program. And as I said, we try to pay attention to fiscal management to ensure accountability and compliance. And then finally, we pay a good deal of attention to financial sustainability training and support, very, very, very early on in the launching of a particular initiative of a particular program. We invest in program development. And by that we mean we provide support and strategies for in depth development of all program components. We provide on-going and detailed feedback on the implementation of all those components. We create and monitor work plans and we have found a boring and has hard and as difficult as it is, that work plans are key. They are great guides to moving the work forward, to holding everybody accountable, to knowing where we all are as we're progressing in a program implementation. We ensure solid strategies and steps are in place to move -- to meet project benchmarks, and then we facilitate effective partnerships between government, agencies, businesses and then faith and community-based organizations.

P/PV also invest in expert staff to support faith-based and community organizations. So we provide support to the participating organizations through the services of an experience program officer. And that program officer is generally an organizations main contact with Public/Private Ventures and with the other partners in the initiative. Program officers make monthly and generally one to two day visits to the organizations to provide technical assistance and program monitoring. Program officers have frequent telephone conversations and monthly phone audits and written correspondence with the organization so that we can understand and manage any issues that might be arising. The program officers offer the sites extensive experience in designing and implementing and managing all of the complex program components that are part of these major initiatives. And finally, the program officer is knowledgeable of the sort of molds and governing structures for program areas. For example, re-entry, or mentoring or labor markets. And if we have time for Q and A, maybe we can say more about that. And then finally, P/PV, the next slide.

Yes. We really pay a lot of attention to rigorous research. We have a large research team in the organization. We have about 15 people on our research team now and of those 15 people, 11 or 12 have PhDs. So, we pay a lot of attention to rigorous. So, our researchers conduct intensive quarterly, on-site research and assessment visit to the organizations. They provide intensive programmatic reviews that offer

information and feedback to the sites about how the projects are progressing. The researchers meet with the organization's executive director, program staff, and board representatives, to talk about the program and how it's going. They assess each organization's progress against established benchmarks, and then finally, they provide feedback to each organization that is aimed at improving management, program design, and implementation.

So, lastly, and ultimately, what is it that we're about here. Well, we want to invest in sustainability. And as I said, in bringing programs to scale. So, P/PV's goal is to leave strong organizations and programs in place at the end of a demonstration or initiative. One of those is Ready for Work. And so for example, of the 17 organizations that were a part of Ready to Work, faith-based and community organizations, 14 are still operating and providing re-entry services. Now, the balance are still operating too, but 14 of those are still providing these services. We are responsible for launching the Amachi Program, which is a mentoring of children of prisoners program. And I'm proud to say that that Amachi Program is now incorporated into Big Brothers, Big Sisters of America as their primary mentoring strategy. And in addition to that, the Department of HHS has provided considerable

resources in the hundreds of millions of dollars as I recall, for mentoring children of prisoners. That program had its origins right with P/PV, right in local churches in Philadelphia, and is now a national program in every state in the country. Thank you. (Applause)

As I mentioned in my introductory remarks, we do a lot when it comes to labor market and workforce. And through our labor market initiatives, we've developed a cadre of strong leaders through the Leaders Academy, and then strong local organizations involved in what we call Sector Initiatives. And then ultimately, and what this group is all about, we know for sure and feel really proud of the fact, that local churches and small community-based organizations, in all the programs that we have worked with, are now equipped with new skills and techniques to ensure long-term sustainability and ultimately to go to scale. And that's our purpose for being in partnership with the government, and foundations. That's why we're here today and we're really pleased, and I'm very pleased to have been invited to this conference and to share some of these thoughts with you. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. ORELL: Thanks to all of you. We are way behind scheduled, and I'm getting the sign from Elizabeth. So, we need to wrap up. But thank you again, all of you, for coming. I hope that this has been a good, and informative session for you, the audience. And thank you for your service to the country.

MS. WIEBE: Hasn't this morning been amazing. It has been. I almost don't even mind going over schedule. And it usually bothers me more than anyone. So, it really has been fantastic. We are going to take a ten second stand and stretch break. So, if you need to stand, this is your opportunity. Please do stand right at your seat. We're not going to break the room. If you feel comfortable sitting for the next 20 seconds please do. But if you really want to stand, this is your chance. So please do. That really was a quick break. We're not even going to leave the room. We're moving right into our next panel. So, please go ahead and have a seat. We're going to move right along. If Jedd Medefind, our next panelist could go up and I'm going to tell you very quickly about a few resources that we have across the hall. We'll let some of our folks get settled here. All right, very good.

Across the hall, some of you may have already seen, we have a couple of exhibit areas. All of our agencies have put out resources just for you. So if you have not already seen them, please do. I want to point out a couple of things that many of you have asked me about that I want you to know are over there. One is a special research report that Baylor University, Baylor has put out for us, just special for this event. I really encourage you to go in and grab a copy of this, Not by Faith or Governmental Alone. They hurried to get this in print and printed just for you. So, if you have a chance to pick that up. The other thing is, this afternoon and later on this morning, you'll have two breakout sessions that will highlight research from all aspects of the initiative. This research will include data outcomes, evaluation on topics from prisoner reentry to international asset development. You will enjoy these.

You will notice that almost all of the presenters have written research papers in preparation for this event. All of those have been collected in this document and will also be posted on- line. So you will be able to either download them, or please feel free to stop by the HHS table. And if you want to heft this back in your suitcase, there are still a few copies back there. The last thing I want to show you is something that was already mentioned this morning by Steve Goldsmith. It is a compilation of the FBCI, and kind of an overview in all 50 states. You will find a page no matter what state you are in on some small amount of data and some illustrations that shows amazing results across the country. If you did not receive one of these yesterday, before we break to go to the session after this panel, we'll have some people standing at the door, that we have a few left. And they'll have them if you need one of those. All right. With no further ado, we're going to move right to our last panel. Jedd, if you could come up, and then after the panel, you can just dismiss for lunch.

PANEL 3: ENGAGING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS THROUGH VOUCHERS AND OTHER CHOICE MECHANISMS

MR. MEDEFIND: Okay. For our third and final panel this morning, we're going to be talking about choice mechanisms. Now, if I can ask you to just close your eyes for just a minute. Let's imagine something. Close your eyes. And imagine yourself walking onto a car lot, maybe CarMax, or something like that. And all around you, you see the full array of American cars, foreign cars, all the car options that we have. And there are long cars and short cars and fast cars and big cars and four-wheel drives and there are cars with electric locks and windows and sun roof and driver side air bag, and there's anti-lock breaks and all of that. And now, erase that image for a moment, and imagine that there's only one car company in the whole country that makes cars for you to choose from. And imagine what that car lot would probably look like. There would maybe two or three different kinds of cars. They'd all probably look a lot the same. You probably wouldn't have a lot of those technological advances and options because there wasn't enough competition to drive the company to make them because they knew that you were going to buy them from them whether you liked it or not. Okay, so we'll go ahead and open those eyes if you haven't already.

But of course the tragedy at times of American compassion has been that that later story has often been America's Government's way of approaching human need. It's been large. It's been in bulk. It's been largely one- size-fits-all. It's been dreamed up by individuals within government and then presented to people without very much choice or say in the matter whatsoever. And part of the driving energy of the Faith-Based and Community Initiative has been towards saying, we've got to expand those options. We've got to work through the local organizations that are creating all kinds of innovative ways to solve problems, and allow individuals real choice in the different ways that they receive help. And when we're able to do that through vouchers or other mechanisms, it has a lot of different advantages. First of all, it expands the range of options. Because when the Government's doing something itself, or perhaps it has one grant to one large organization, you simply just have one option there, and it's kind of a take-it-or-leave-it proposition for the individual. But as soon as you start expanding beyond that and you say to an individual, we're going to let you choose an organization that's best equipped to meet your distinctive needs, then suddenly proliferating all around are different models and different options and different designs of programs. And so it creates a much more diverse range of opportunities.

It also deals with church-state issues that can sometimes be complex in more direct grant opportunities. In normal direct grant opportunity, if a faith-based group receives the funds, they have to keep separate any religious privately-funded activities from the publically-funded activity. They need to be held at a different time and location. But if it's a voucher situation, where an individual client has a legitimate choice among different options, then that isn't necessary. The Government doesn't have to police that. Because if a person wants to choose a faith-based program that has faith elements in it, that's fine. That's their own choice in that. And so it relieves that situation and kind of takes it off the table. And finally, perhaps more importantly, it allows an individual to choose a program that's best suited to meet their own personal needs, their own personal situation and it makes them and that process more engaged in their own process of recovery or education or the path towards a new beginning.

And so what we're going to be talking about in this panel is various innovations that are seeking to create choice mechanisms through vouchers or other models that move that forward, and thereby empower local social entrepreneurs that are providing these creative outside-of-the-box services to be a part of our nation's systems of dealing with these complex issues. And so to begin this, we're going to have Virginia Walden Ford, talk about her experience with the D.C. Opportunity Scholarships. The D.C. Opportunity Scholarships are the first Federally-funded scholarships for K-12 students. And it's been piloted here in the Nation's Capitol for low-income families in struggling schools to allow the families to choose among a range of both public as well as private school options for the students. Now, Virginia, was a single mother of three. And two of her students went through the public school system, but the third was facing great challenges with safety, as well as the quality of education. And he was given a private grant and a choice in schools. And out of the tremendous benefits that came to him through that opportunity, Virginia decided that she wanted to fight for other families to have that same tremendous option and opportunity that she has. And so she's been deeply involved with this D.C. opportunity scholarships program. So, she's here to tell us more about that. (Applause)

MS. FORD: Thanks Jedd. Good morning. Well, Jedd's told you a little bit about the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program. It's the first Federal program ever in the United States. It is a program that provides \$7500 per student to attend a school of the parent's choice. We, D.C. Parents for School Choice, which is the organization that I founded after my son received a scholarship to go to a private school, and I saw how they could change ones' life, we founded the organization to support parents in D.C. And we were

privileged to be able to be a part of the legislative effort to get the scholarship program passed. So, we invested a lot of time and energy. Once President Bush signed the bill into law, and he was really supportive. I mean, he came out to our programs, touched hands with our parents, so he was really involved in it. Once that was signed into law, we decided that we wanted to continue to be a part of that effort. So, we partnered with the organization that is implementing the education, which is a grant through the Department of Education, which is Washington Scholarship Fund, to do outreach into the community in order to make sure that every child that deserved this grant, that was eligible for this scholarship, would be able to access it. And you know, as we got started and did this, we thought, we bring the parents downtown, we have them sign the applications and we'll get hundreds and thousands of people involved. And what we found is that it is a -- it is difficult to get low-income parents downtown. It requires money and trying to get kids down there with you, bringing materials, not having the opportunity to go home and pick up those materials.

So, we realized that what we had to do was go out into the community. Well, our organization had worked with charter school parents also. We knew charter schools. We knew something about the community, but we were talking about going into areas of D.C. that were very challenging. But you also have to be there, if the families live, we're going to go there. And some of these people just were reluctant to take their teens and go into and serve. But, we did. And we found that the way to do that, that the way that we could link with the community was faith- based organizations.

So, we began to work with about 40 faith-based organizations to get them to set up meetings for us in the community to talk to parents and to get parents to sign up for these applications. With these organizations, because they had a relationship with the parents, and these were parents that we went into the Community of Hope, it's the homeless family shelter, the House of Ruth, which is a women's domestic abuse shelter. We went into -- we worked with Martha's Place, we worked with churches, and they had a relationship with those families. So they were able to give our team, we have a traveling team of about six or seven, that go into different parts of the community and actually sit down with parents and have them fill out the applications. We're on their turf, so they can go to the apartments, or go home and pick up information that they need to bring for the application process. But not only, it also gave us, our little team credibility because they had already built a trust relationship with those, with the people that they worked with, and who were we coming into the communities offering anything? Unfortunately, in the communities that we serve, there's not a lot of trust of government programs like this. And there have been an awful lot

of controversy about the program. So, before we got into the community, a lot of times the families had been told that this was not real. So, we had to build a relationship. We had to build trust. In the course of the program, the program -- we did over 300 community meetings. We went into every sector of D.C. where parents might be eligible for the scholarship program and served those families per the instruction of Congress. I mean, one of the problems with this particular kind of program, this is the first Federal voucher program, but there are other voucher programs. Milwaukee has one, Florida has one. So, one of the problems has been that it would -- sometime the departments say that it doesn't get to the people that need serving the most. So it was really important to us that we went to families who would be eligible. This program served families with income of 185 percent below the poverty level. So, these are poorest of the poor families in D.C. These are the kids who would not have access to programs otherwise, whose parents have so many other things that they're dealing with that trying to figure out how to pay for their child to go to a school of this kind of, a private school, was just unthought of.

So, we went and talked to parents that -- whose children were incredible. And so I want to tell you a little tiny bit before my time runs out about these kids. Pam Battle, is a single mother in D.C. with three children, one daughter who graduated from DCPS and was scared to go to school every single day of her high school life. Two sons, one was in junior high one elementary school when this program started four years ago, who she feared for every day. One of the son's went to empty the trash one day and was attacked and beaten. And that's the environment she was living in. So it was really vital to her that she get her boys out of this kind of environment. She signed up for the scholarship program, and happily, I can report to you that Carlos is a 15-year-old, finishing his sophomore year, going into his junior year at Georgetown Day, which is a prestigious school here in Washington, is on the honor roll. Right now as we sit here -- (Applause)

Right now as we sit here, he's in Mexico on a school mission, you know. Her other son Calvin, is also on the honor roll, will be going into the seventh grade at St. Gabriele's, a Catholic school, next year, and is doing incredibly well. You know, we have other kids in the program who have just grown beyond expectations. They've done so well, and I'm not short, but I have to lean a little bit, so we're so excited that this program has been these children. But, as I close, I want to tell you one story really quickly. Because I think it just kind of tells what this is all about. We served a family in an area of D.C. that was really, really difficult. A father came in who wanted his son to be in the program, but he didn't read, the father didn't read. He was clearly high. And I mean, you know, he just was struggling. But he told me, he said, I really want

my son to be in this program. So, my team set and helped him fill out the application and his son got into the program. A year later, I ran into -- we ran into this same father, who we didn't recognize. He was sharp as a tack. He was, you know, just incredible. And he told us that his son had done so well in the scholarship program, at some point, he decided he didn't want to embarrass his son, so he thought he better get his act together. (Applause)

Yes, that's right. So, he went to a substance abuse program and finished that. He went to an employment program and finished that. He was currently working on his GED. And he said to me, Virginia, he said, you don't understand. This program doesn't just serve children. It helps families and it saved me and mine. Thank you.

MR. MEDEFIND: Thank you, Virginia. Once-size-fits-all programs have one advantage. They are simple. Very easy to administer. You just create one product and when people come in the door you give it to them, and that's pretty straight forward. As soon as you start trying to inject choice into that, real options, working with front line groups that each have their own little quirks, it becomes more complicated. And so the work of shifting the way that government deals with this, and finding creative ways to add choice without making it too complicated is a policy challenge of the first order. And so one of the innovations that has been launched by the Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in the last year has been a hybrid between something a little bit more like vouchers and a more traditional government contracting method. And it's called Beneficiary Choice Contracting. And it's in its early stages. We don't know if it's going to work. That's the nature of true innovation. But someone who is in the very thick of that is Karri Schultheis. Karri is a ten year veteran of the Department of Corrections in Arizona. But now she leads a program that is advancing this, testing this, trying it out, and seeing if Beneficiary Choice Contracting can help individuals who are coming out of incarceration and allow them to choose among various options on that path towards job and new life, new hope. So, Karri, welcome. (Applause)

MS. SCHULTHEIS: Thank you, Jedd. I have some slides prepared for you today as well if we can get those going, please. Good morning. Arizona Women's Education and Employment, or AWEE, has been changing lives through the dignity of work since 1981. In recent years through continued analysis of participant profiles, AWEE has observed a steady increase in the number of female and male formerly incarcerated individuals walking through the doors desiring workforce development service. Next slide please. The

prison population as a whole continues to rise. According to the "One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008" report by the Pew Charitable Trust Center on the states, the national prison census at the end of 2007 was over 1.5 million adults. Add to that the population in the jails, and you have a staggering total of over 2.3 million adults. In this report, Arizona was ranked in the highest fifth of the states.

Next slide please. In response to the growing need for prisoner re-entry services, AWEE applied for the Prisoner Re-Entry Initiative grant, and was awarded in 2005. Based on the U.S. Department of Labor analysis of the PRI project for the last few years, a specific age range was identified to be missing from the participant demographics, 18 to 29 year olds. Shifting from a traditional drug client service model, Department of Labor released an SGA challenging faith-based and community organizations to develop a program Utilizing a Beneficiary choice Contracting model. Awarded in July 2007, AWEE was one of five recipients nationally. The Beneficiary Choice model utilizes the grantee as a service coordinator, or administrative entity and opens the door for faith-based and community organizations to deliver the drug client services. The model allows clients to review information on each specialized service provider, or SSP, during a program orientation facilitated by AWEE before they make an informed choice of which provider best suits their individual needs or circumstance. The provider may or may not have faith infused services.

Next slide. The specific rules and responsibilities are illustrated here. After eligibility is confirmed through our criminal justice partner, recruitment, intake and assessment is completed by AWEE. After the participant chooses their provider, there is a baton-exchange between AWEE and the SSP. After enrollment occurs, the SSP is responsible for delivering comprehensive services to overcome any participant barriers to employment. The AWEE case manager works in tandem with SSP case manager to ensure the participant is receiving the appropriate level of service based on their identified needs. After the participants secures a job, and is stable, the SSP remains in contact with them to provide supportive services geared toward job retention. AWEE supports the SSP with a variety of technical assistance -- excuse me -- from enrollment through retention. AWEE has extensive experience working with formerly incarcerated individuals, and we continually share our best practices with our SSPs to ensure overall project success.

Next slide please. The idea of performance-based contracting was new to some providers. Even those who had experience with the concept had initial concern over the benchmarks AWEE had established. However, AWEE found the balance between attainable benchmarks to ensure monthly cash

flow and more difficulty benchmarks with established time frames. All benchmarks align with long-term project goals. The Beneficiary Choice model emphasizes the participants ability to choose their provider. As such, there's no guarantee for work for the SSP. When the project launched, all the SSPs devoted part of a case manager to the program. Therefore, case managers were split between two or sometimes three different projects. This obviously created a hardship for the case managers to adequately serve the participant and maintain the appropriate level of documentation. After the SSPs began to increase their enrollment numbers, they decided to devote one full time case manager to this project. AWEE elected to provide the SSPs equal opportunity for work by requesting the SSP at a monthly limit of enrollments to their contract. Once the SSP reaches their monthly cap, they're removed as a choice, therefore allowing other SSPs to be chosen. In the beginning, there was a period of relationship building between AWEE and the SSPs. Each SSP is its own stand- alone agency. It was difficult to adjust to individual cultures. Since AWEE's administrative lead, the providers had to adapt to our methodology of service delivery, protocol and documentation. As the SSPs encountered challenges, they were hesitant to share any concerns or issues with us. After we established monthly program manager and case manager meetings, trust began to build between the agencies, and we slowly became a team.

Next slide please. The greatest success of the project thus far is a true sense of collaboration between team members. The agencies have seen the advantage of working as a whole instead of in silos. Since participant employment is a high-dollar benchmark along with one of the key measures of project success, the SSPs were reluctant to share their employer relationships. However, this has changed. We have combined forces, and next month, we are hosting an employer breakfast. Each SSP has been actively involved in the planning process and has assigned tasks. We are all inviting key stakeholders, partners, employers we currently work with, and reaching out to new employers to educate them on the benefits of hiring formerly incarcerated people. We have a goal of establishing 20 new employer relationships from which all agencies can utilize, and we hope to have this kind of event on a quarterly basis. AWEE service providers include some faith-based grassroots organizations, along with long-standing community-based agencies. Since the project encompasses a variety of people in the community, the number of stakeholders was increased. Through the SSP's internal and external relationships, the awareness of service population has been amplified. The grant stipulates the grantee is supposed to increase capacity among the SSPs. This is an easy accomplishment when speaking about my faith-based providers. However, through our technical assistance, key learnings have been shared with our long-

standing organizations as well. With frequent monitoring and concrete protocol, SSPs have been able to think differently about how they serve people and document their outcomes. The unique success thus far has been the creativity of my faith-based providers. Since they do not have a traditional company policy to adhere to, they have the most flexibility and out-of- the-box approaches. It is refreshing to see these providers alter hours, procedure, or find new services in an effort to better serve their participants. This project has given faith- based providers an opportunity to help people they may not have known if the project had not connected them.

Next slide please. The first program year ends this November. I look forward to sharing the benefits and lessons learned with working with this new model. Overall, so far we've had success with the reduction of recidivism, with only two people going back to prison at our six-month mark out of 137 enrolled. (Applause) Thank you. Thank you for your continued partnerships and for your attention. (Applause)

MR. MEDEFIND: Okay. For our final panelist, we're going to be now looking from -- at a program that's a bit more mature, that we've experienced the lessons of years and seen what transpires. We're talking about Access to Recovery, which you heard about some yesterday from Drug Czar Walters, from the President himself. And it's the largest scale voucher program ever attempted, and it's focused on the addiction recovery area. And it was launched by the President at a State of the Union address. And initially, the grants were offered and through a competitive process, 14 states and one Tribal Authority, won those grants in order use the funds to start their own voucher-based system. So, we're talking about 15 different unique test zones, where these states could create these systems and enlist large numbers of nonprofits to provide both clinical recovery services as well as supportive services that help people walk the road from addiction to recovery. And so one of the most interesting and effective programs was the State of Connecticut. The individual whose lead that is Commissioner Tom Kirk, Dr. Thomas Kirk, who is a clinical psychologist. He has published a number of papers, very respected in his field around the country. And he also serves on the National Advisory Council for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. And so please welcome Dr. Kirk. (Applause)

DR. KIRK: Good morning. I'm the director of a healthcare plan in Connecticut. Connecticut's got a population of three and a half million people. This healthcare plan that I'm overseeing treats 80,000 people a year. What do I want in that healthcare plan? If you go to a healthcare plan or a healthcare service

provider, what do you expect? What do you expect? What do you want? You want to get better. You want to get better. That should apply for people of psychiatric illnesses as well as people with substance abuse disorders. I want the people who get that service have an expectation and the hope that they will get better. I want them to have accessible services, easy to reach. I want them to have faith in themselves that they can be resilient, and confident that they can be renewed. This lead to the need to move toward what we call social entrepreneurs. These are community, faith-based groups and providers essential to the above.

Let me give you a listing, just run through some names, go back to my point about hope, expectation of recovery, better lives: New Beginning Ministry, Taste and See Outreach, Believe in Me Empowerment, New Leaf, New Life Outreach Ministries, Faith Lives, Stepping Stones, Solid Rock, Community of Hope, Ministries of Love and Hope, Right Now Ministries, Repairing the Breaches Ministries, Turning Point, House of Healing. All of those names are names of organizations that we've partnered with as part of this particular effort. So, if some one is going to those, those organizations basically are their choice, I want them to feel there's hope, they're going to get better, their lives are going to be improved.

Can we go to the slide? I'm actually going to -- There are many past recovery, many past recovery. Now, some would say, after this guy got on that horse, he fell off. But isn't that what life is about? All of us in our lives have disappointments, we lose our jobs, hopefully we don't lose our family. But we have tremendous challenges, but we go on. And that's the same for here also. But I wanted to go to those folks and say, what is it that -- what are paths that you need to have? What kinds of services do you need? Where do you want to get it? And this gets to the choice.

Go to the next one please. This is a really, really important slide. I'm a psychologist by background. That's what I did for a long period of time. But the guy that's at that center, that poorly designed stick figure, that's what it's all about. It's about people. It's about what they need. And so, with the person at the center, not the organization, not my story, so this is what we're about. I have to also work under the premise that people will seek or accept assistance from people they know and trust. Right? You will seek assistance, accept assistance from people you know and trust. That being the case, with my background, I would say that if I had a particular problem with my family, my wife would probably go to a faith person to say, Thomas, having a problem, this family needs some help. That's her orientation, that's what we're about. So, what we tried through Access to Recovery Committee, is that we wanted to improve access, a larger number, 19,000 people were service in our Access to Recovery program. That was 2,000 more than we ever imagined would be done. Seven thousand of those persons selected faith- based agencies to get their

services from. Forty percent of those persons had never had any involvement with our system at all. Forty percent of those person were person of color. That is twice the number of persons representative in our service system. Access, outreach, it was working. How to engage -- one other point. I have a strong belief in culture. Culture, I describe as the lens in my eye that I interpret who you are. It's the filter in my ear that when you and I talk, do I feel comfortable with you. It's the membrane in my hand when we shake hands or hug, do I feel comfortable with you. People are at the center, one must respect the culture of that individual in terms of what it is they want.

How do we engage as social entrepreneurs? One of the best investments I ever made was in 1999, committed \$20,000 to a person at St. Francis Hospital in Hartford, a gentleman named Rev. Marcus McKinney. He's a minister as well as a commissioner. And what he had is a faith- based pastoral counseling session. The community was heavily impacted by 9/11. And the Governor established an executive order to partner with the faith-based communities. They developed what are known as faith-based crisis networks. This evolved over the years. So, when 2004 came, and Access to Recovery was announced as a grant, I could go to over hundreds of those faith-based providers and say, What is it you think we need in terms of Access to Recovery. They helped to do that. How to engage in social entrepreneurs? One, real simple, this is my terms: Listen and Learn. We went to these various organizations, peer based organizations and say, what is it you do? What have you been doing for all these years and never got paid for, but you found to be effective. And so we were going to define the services, how they would make it a success and paid for it.

So they talked about recovery support groups within great faith and recovery. They talked about how a new way to forge community relationships. We want people to live in the community, that's where they're going to be and we talked how they mentored and guided people in recovery. All right, fine. Those are the services, let's put them in, let's put an amount of money on them, a time that they can be provided, and furthermore, just how they will be provided. We talked to people in recovery, extraordinary force. What do you need, how do you do it and so on. We came up with similar types of pieces. They learned from us. We said, you can't charge us ten bucks on a Sunday for 200 people in the church. That's not a group service. How do you manage this in such a way that's a reimbursable service, and furthermore, how do you document, how do you follow the procedures in terms of care? In my state, in this case, you got \$22 million to use over three years, I've got an accountability. I can't simply throw the money away, paid attention to that. On site visits, go into these different groups that we have, double the number of faith-based providers

we began with, and help them to understand what's going on in your services, how we can help you to understand how to provide them.

Another group, Connecticut Community for Addition Recovery. They've set up some programs that we're funding, what you have to do, so you want to set up a sober house. How do you do something like that? Houses? The vouchers. Two types of vouchers that we came up with. One of them was actually a paper voucher, it was like a check, and the other one was a virtual voucher where the organization would be credentialed, they could provide services to the individual, the client. They get their voucher so-to-speak, and they could go any of the providers that they want. They could change providers at will. Provider agreement, rate schedule, authorization guidelines. It is now web-based, so we try to get away from all the paper that was driving them crazy in the beginning first A2R, we're in second A2R now. What's the important piece about choice? You know the guy that was at the center, that little diagram, he or she is the one that should be able to choose what it is. Why? Because he or she is responsible for managing their own recovery. If they do not feel empowered, then they would be depending upon the system for ever and ever. People are not born with mental illness. People are not born with substance abuse problem. They had lives before that, and our responsibility is to help them to renew their lives to recognize their strengths. (Applause)

Forty-two seconds. What work? You heard Director Walters talk about the other day about the statistics. And I can give you the statistics. When a person in recovery, when a faith-based person comes before our legislature, talks about what it is that has happened to them, I can tell you, it's extraordinary. They have the face of a person in a faith-based program that their faith, they're a person in recovery. Seven thousand people selected faith-based providers. Nineteen thousand people were served. Forty percent of them were never seen in the service system before they were brought in. Forty-four percent of all recovery support services were provided by a faith-based provided. Over 100,000 different services were provided to the 19,000 people, four or five persons to serve. We committed 85 percent of the \$22 million in recovery support services. I'm a clinician, but I truly believe the recovery support services were the difference that made the difference. What's the mechanism for success in this? Respect for the individuals you're working for, listen to what they have to say, and learn from them. As we go into A2R, which is the second one, the focus is on the criminal justice system. Our legislature and our governor said, we will not build new prisons. All right? We're not going to build new prisons. (Applause)

If you're not going to build new prisons, and Connecticut has, we're with the tops of the nation for X number of years, in slowing the growth of its prison population. Then you have to make sure that they're diverted from the front door. If they cannot, they get tied up with services. So, our whole focus i Access to Recovery II, is totally based upon the criminal justice population, people on probation, people who are coming out of the prison system, diverted from them. And one of the best things that we learned from the first one, 40 percent of the persons that were on probation who were return to prison before -- I'm sorry. Forty percent reduction in the number persons returned to prison after they've been on probation because of a technical violation, 40 percent. Each day in Connecticut, there are 57,000 people on probation. You talk about a 40 percent reduction in violations, that's an extraordinary measure. I go back to something that one of the individuals before mentioned. This is about money, this is about organizations. Never forget what it's about. It's the person at the center of that. That's the mission. That's the value. What you and I do every day, is help people to recover their lives. It's all about the lives of people and what a great legacy to have in terms of a career and work and what we do. When all is said and done, one of the things I've learned from all of this is that, yes, I've had my training. I've done this for a long period of time. The whole service system that I operated, that's a \$650 million system, I run it to convert it to something that mirrors Access to Recovery. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

MR. MEDEFIND: All right. That is inspiring. Thank you, each of you. And it's work that's on-going, as we said earlier. Innovation by definition is on-going. And that's what so many -- here in the final year of President Bush's term, we have, we're launching these new things like Beneficiary Choice Contracting, the Mentoring Children of Prisoners program just added a voucher element that's being tested right now and just getting off the ground, the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship program, and Access to Recovery II, as Dr. Kirk mentioned, just the new round of grants went out. Now, it's I think 19 states and four tribal authorities. I think that's the number. Building on all the learning of the first three years, to a whole new round of things and listing new nonprofit partners in addiction recovery and so many other things. So, let's give a final round of applause to these great panelists. (Applause)

And now we're going to be going ahead into break for our workshops. They will begin in five minutes since we're going to really -- we don't want to rob you of one ounce of knowledge that is being prepared there. And then we'll, following that, be coming in here for lunch. And Elizabeth, is there anything else that we need to share with folks?

MODERATOR HEIN: We do want to begin the program. We have a lot of material to cover this afternoon. You will be honored to hear from our next speaker, who is Governor Felix Camacho, who is the Governor of the Territory of Guam. I have gotten to know the governor well this past year. And I know his heart as a servant. He is a person of faith. And he is a very faithful leader of the territory that he represents. We are so honored to have him. He is in his second term as Governor of Guam. He is also the son of the first elected Governor of Guam. The governors were formally appointed on the territory. Until his father, who is the first – and you are now the sixth governor, as I understand it -- was the first one elected. And Governor Camacho has also served four terms in the legislature. So he is a terrific leader. And he is also one who admires so much your work. He has talked to me often about the value of the nonprofit community on the island, and he will share some thoughts with you about it now. But what he represents is so much of what today's theme is, which is the future. We know that the future is in problem-solving and it's in place. The future isn't in a Washington, D.C. debate. We just want to make the environment better for you, Governor. So we will be eager to welcome you to the podium now. And we thank you so very much for your leadership and your presence here today. (Applause.)

LUNCHEON KEYNOTE

GOVERNOR CAMACHO: Well, good afternoon. And, Jay, thank you so much for the kind introduction. As mentioned, my name is Felix Camacho. I am the Governor of the Territory of Guam. I am sure many of you, I hope some of you, do know of it. (Laughter.)

We are quite far away. We are the western-most territory of the United States. It took seven hours from Guam to Honolulu and then another five hours from Honolulu to the West Coast. Actually, we flew from Honolulu or Kauai to Chicago and then down in here. So you can imagine it has taken a whole day to get here. Jay, thank you so much. (Applause.)

I think it is significant to know that not only in the continental United States but its territories, inclusive of Guam, there is also the Northern Marianas and then the rest of what's called Micronesia. If you spread out the islands, it's larger than the contiguous United States. But most of it is ocean. (Laughter.)

So you can see the extent of faith-based and community initiatives reaches out into Asia Pacific. Now, everything that we have seen and heard over the past two days has pointed definitively in a single

direction. Government is most effective in addressing human need when it welcomes every effective partner, faith-based and secular, large and small. It is most effective when it taps into and multiplies the ingenuity of social entrepreneurs when it harnesses the passion of dedicated volunteers and the compassion of neighbors serving neighbors.

Looking back over the past seven years of President Bush's Faith-Based and Community Initiative, the results have been impressive: nearly 90,000 children of prisoners matched with caring mentors; exoffenders returning to prison at rates less than half the national average; 200-plus thousand adults or addicts helped towards recovery through thousands of faith-based and other community organizations, many partnering with government for the first time ever; major reductions in the number of homeless veterans and chronic homelessness overall; millions of AIDS victims in Africa restored to health and vigor. This demonstrates what can occur when dedicated nonprofit organizations are given a central role in national efforts to solve the great human needs of our day.

Let me propose that I believe that what lies ahead will be even more exciting than what has already been achieved. Let me give you three reasons for that. First, a tremendous foundation has been laid for the future expansion. We now have a broad range of proven tools to use that that enable the government to tap into the unique strengths of grass roots nonprofit organizations: intermediary grants, vouchers, beneficiary choice contracting, Web-based networks. We also have clear constitutional guidelines for government partnerships with faith-based groups so that can become or welcomed as full and equal allies in this vital work. And pioneers do the hard work. They have gone, and they have got to cut down the trees, break the soil, and learn what grows well and what doesn't. Now that much of the pioneering work is done, we can build far more quickly, benefitting from the testing and learning successes and failures that have come before. Second is the vision of the faith-based and community initiatives is well-aligned with the future we all knew was coming. Whether in commerce, government, education, or charity, the future isn't one of centrally designed command and control systems. As we have heard from Steve Goldsmith this morning, it is by network. Problem-solving in the past brought together a handful of experts in capital city to design programs. Problem-solving of the future taps the brightest and most passionate people from across the country and does it in ways that are well fit to each unique situation they address. That approach is at the heart of the Faith-Based and Community Initiative vision. And, third, the American people stand ready to help us in this effort.

Giving to America's charities hit an all-time high last year, topping \$300 billion for the first time. Volunteerism is at historic heights as well. And all across the nation, innovative source entrepreneurs are bringing new solutions to age-old problems. So this future is not merely or even primarily a single national one, but, rather, it is a vision that will be owned and multiplied by leaders at every level. It will find unique forward-leaning expressions in cities, counties, states, and territories. It is governors, mayors, and countless others embracing the Faith-Based and Community Initiative fully, as it really is a critical and effective strategy for solving real world problems. Now, this portrait of the future I am painting is not merely prophetic. It is already happening. Today 35 governors have Faith-Based and Community Initiative offices or liaisons of their own. This includes 18 Democrats and 17 Republicans. It is clear that this vision transcends politics in a way that very few things can today. And today I am proud as Governor of Guam that I have established a Faith-Based and Community Initiative on Guam. (Applause.)

And, as with the federal initiative, it will be focused, first and foremost, on solving some of the most pressing issues facing the people of Guam and Micronesia. As President Bush describes, it will be a determined attack on need. And I feel it is important that we establish this in the Territory of Guam because if I may just share with you what is happening, imagine we have an island in the middle of the Pacific that is 210 square miles. We have about 170,000 people living there. And the Third Marine Expeditionary Force from Okinawa is moving to Guam. That means we will have a 2 percent increase in our population in a mere 6 years. That means the social impact, the infrastructure impact, and the way of life as we know it as islanders will change dramatically. We call ourselves the tip of the sphere for defense of America in the Pacific. Any hot spot that happens in Asia, a quick response, military response, to that will come from Guam. We have B-1, B-52 bombers, fighters, submarines, nuclear attack. And many ports of call come through our island. So we are at the forefront of the defense of this nation. But our lives will change. And I know that as a government that depends on tourism as its main economic engine, there is no way that we can financially take care of all the social problems that we face. But by partnering with faith-based and community initiatives or organizations, we can do it together. And the key is that: partnering. And so as I close, I want to say that, as I know it, faith is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen. (Applause.)

Thank you. And hope is competent expectancy. And to all of you, I have to say that all of you have the ability as individuals and as organizations to do whatever you need to do. In your faith and in your hope, you can overcome every trial and accomplish things you never thought possible. And I ask that you never

shrink in fear when opportunities or even obstacles come your way. With an attitude of faith and expectancy, you can do great things. And you can bless and you continue to bless others with your good work. You have, each one of you have, a servant's heart that looks for ways to meet other people's needs. And I am talking about people in need, in dire need. All of you are transforming lives from the inside out as you touch the hearts and minds of these people in need. And so I ask, let us not become weary in doing good for at the proper time, we will reap a harvest if we never give up. Thank you and God bless. (Applause.)

MODERATOR HEIN: Thank you so much, Governor.

THE FUTURE OF INNOVATION PANELS

MODERATOR HEIN: You know, we have said often that the future of this initiative is in the states. You will hear from a panel in a short while from other state and local leaders because that is where services are performed. People sometimes in Washington are described in statistical form. Now, we heard from Mayor Goldsmith this morning and Governor Camacho. People are in human-scale form to them. They are neighbors and constituents. So we want to lift up the arms of such leaders and to know that the future is in the states. To hear a set of remarks from you, Governor, means the future looks very bright. And so we are grateful for that. Made all the more impressive, by the way, he told you his journey here. It is about 3:30 in the morning in Guam. So if we feel a little sluggish after lunch, can you imagine how he feels when he delivers those remarks? (Laughter.) Thank you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

I would like to turn your attention to the big screen as soon as I get off it. There we go. We have at this Web address at the bottom of the screen, which is also a Web site that can be accessed on the White House faith-based initiative Web site, which is a little easier to key in and remember, which is fbci.gov, as we talked about yesterday. I wanted to draw your attention to the conference Web site, which we talked a little bit about yesterday, but I want to share with you, is now live. This is hosted by Health and Human Services. And it has critical information that we have been discussing these past couple of days: research, documents. There are great human need fact sheets that were on your chair in paper form at this luncheon that are also in .pdf form, on this Web site. There is a research compendium, where a lot of our speakers' presentations, the content with which they're drawing from, is material on this Web site. But there is also

material from this conference on the Web site. So all of yesterday's presentations, the President's and the Cabinet members' presentations, in video form and in transcription, are available already on this Web site. And today's proceedings will be made available in the next couple of days. So I commend this to you. And I hope it is a Web site that you will not only use following this conference but that you will come back to because it is a rich display of information. We are going to use this a bit as a seguel to our next panel.

I believe that Karl Zinsmeister may be here. Karl Zinsmeister is Assistant to the President and my boss in the Domestic Policy Council. So I invite him to come forward and moderate the next panel, which will feature some of our nation's leading researchers. Please join me and help me welcome Karl Zinsmeister. (Applause).

PANEL I: THE FUTURE OF INNOVATION & RESEARCH REGARDING AMERICA'S SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: I am not really Jay's boss. I think you all know that. We are good colleagues and do enjoy working next to each other. As Jay mentioned, I am the President's Domestic Policy Adviser. And I want to thank you on my own behalf and on the President's behalf. He had a wonderful time here yesterday, by the way, really enjoyed himself. And I want to thank you very sincerely for the tremendous work that you all do. Our panel, which is going to join me here in just a second -- in fact, they can start on their way up if they'd like. Our panel actually, it occurred to me, represents sort of three generations of people who have done social policy for U.S. presidents. We are going to have somebody who did domestic policy with Richard Nixon and somebody who did domestic policy with Bill Clinton and somebody who did it with George Bush. I think I can probably speak for the other two when I say we would love to have you all put us out of business. And to the extent that we could get America's social problems solved from outside Washington, all the better.

You know, I was thinking as I drove over here, just strictly as a practical matter, if you were to sit down today and kind of draw up a list of social problems in this country and then in the column next to it you started listing some of the organizations that have proved to be the very most effective at solving those social problems, I really think that any accurate and honest accounting would end up with a very heavy dose of faith-based institutions. Just kind of run through the list in your own mind. I'm sure you have your own list, but I just jotted down Habitat for Humanity, Intercity Catholic Schools, the Salvation Army,

Alcoholic Anonymous, True Love Waits, Prison Fellowship, Marriage Encounter. You can go on and on. These are some of the very most successful groups in the United States at fixing ugly social problems. And linking them all you will find one common thread, which is, of course, that they are all faith-filled and Godcentered in their approach. So just as kind of an empirical fact, I think it has to interest you if you are charged with lifting up Americans who are hurting today. It has to get your attention that these are the kinds of groups that often end up at the top of our lists.

Those of us who are in government are well-aware that before you put the weight of the state behind an idea, it is really important that you do your research, that you show your work, that you offer the public accountability, accountability for results. The purpose of our next panel is really to ask whether the apparent effectiveness of faith-based groups that I have just described really is the case and to what extent we can demonstrate this in a more methodical way. So what we did, we asked Byron Johnson, who is a very gifted sociologist who has done I think more comparative research in this area than anyone I know of in the country. We asked him to review the last couple of decades of social science and sort of summarize what it says about the effectiveness of faith-based social work. And then we invited comments on Byron's findings from Bill Galston, who was an architect of Bill Clinton's domestic policy; and from Dick Nathan, who was an important aide to Richard Nixon. So we are going to start with Byron.

Dr. Byron Johnson is a professor at Baylor University in Texas and co-Director of the Baylor Institute for Studies of Religion. Byron? (Applause.)

DR. B. JOHNSON: What Karl didn't tell you was that when he called me about this session, he said, you know, "It would be very helpful if you would consider reviewing the literature again -- you did this back in 2002 -- and sharing that at the conference." I thought, well, if I had a year to prepare for that, that might be something that would be worth doing, but to do it in a hurry, it might be a little bit of a problem. And then he said, "Then we will have Bill Galston and Dick Nathan to basically critique that." I thought, well, that's really great. (Laughter.)

So you are going to have just a short period of time to review all of this literature and then to have these two guys to critique it. What I have done here, I have had this question asked of me for years. We hear so much about these groups. And what can you say about their effectiveness? I think the story that I am going to share with you this morning is one that or this afternoon gives you some insights to the

effectiveness of these groups, but I want to do it in a little bit of a round-about way. So if you could? Can I advance these slides here? I guess I can, can't I? Yes. There we go.

Back in 2002, I reviewed a lot of studies that had one variable in common. And that variable was religion. I wanted to see how religion affected various kinds of outcomes. You can see on this slide this was a lot of different areas that a lot of people are concerned about. And so, all total, I reviewed almost 500 studies. There it is. And I did what we call a systematic review. And the review basically summarized these studies over disciplines. This is about 498 studies within the social and behavioral sciences looking at things like crime and delinquency or suicidal ideation, longevity, blood pressure. So a lot of this research I was reviewing was appearing in medical journals. What you find if you look at this is that these studies seem to have an overwhelming pattern that religion is associated with benefit. And so that is what that looked like in 2002. And what Karl was interested in is, what does that literature look like in 2008? This is the trend that you will see, now about 894 studies published in just these areas. And there is a whole methodology about how one would track down these studies. You basically use a lot of different search engines. And then once you find a study, you look at the bibliography and the references. And that leads you to more studies. So another 400 studies on top of the ones that we looked at back in 2002. And the patterns are almost identical that religion shows benefit.

Now, I want to make an observation here. I don't want to get too jargony, but a preferred method would be what we call meta analysis, which would be where you look at effect sizes in these different studies to do, actually, a much better job of comparing them to see what you would find. There just wasn't enough time to do a meta, although I am working on a major meta analysis in the area of crime and delinquency and drug and alcohol at this time but not in such a sweeping way as all of these studies. So if we know that religion at least has an effect when you look at these studies, this is what it looks like when you look at another set of outcomes. And these are what we would call pro-social outcomes. And here is the pattern. This is 2002. I hope you can see that. This is 171 different studies, basically the overwhelming majority finding that religion is associated with beneficial outcomes in terms of well-being, hope, purpose, et cetera, educational attainment. And now this is what it looks like updated to just this week, 217 studies of very similar pattern. Okay?

Now, faith-based organizations. A number of you represent faith-based organizations. What do we know about those? And here I am just summarizing that literature that you just saw that basically says religion is now considered a protective factor, on the one hand, from protecting people from harmful

outcomes. And it also appears to be a pro-social variable that helps foster good things. Now here is what we look like if we look at faith-based organizations back in 2002. I only found about 25 studies that were empirical. So the bad news is we don't have very much evidence on faith-based organizations. To this date, we don't have one empirical study published on the Salvation Army, not one. So if one were opposed to the role of faith-based organizations, you should argue, "Oh, well. Let's discount the Salvation Army. There is no evidence to prove they have any impact whatsoever," at least on the empirical side. And the reality is that is very hard research to conduct. It is very easy for me to use the ad health data set or the general social survey and sit at my desk and crank out an article while I test a theory, but to go into one of your organizations where you are reaching out to homeless and to track people in some kind of an experimental design, which is obviously what we would like to do, is very difficult to do. In fact, one of the problems is it is almost impossible to do when you have a variable like religion that you are studying because you would have to randomly assign people into the control and experimental groups. And then you run into all kinds of other issues.

Now, one of the things that is really disturbing -- and I will be winding this up here -- is I did find a lot of studies on FBOs. The problem is they are not empirical. People like to write about the constitutional issues surrounding the FBOs, the compliance issues surrounding the FBOs. And so that is what you will find. So I found hundreds of studies, but as I go through the list, you just mark them off one after the other because they are not systematic studies and they're not experimental. Some of them are quasi-experimental and off a lot of case studies. This is what I found. I found 50 studies published. And, again, if I were to do this and had more time, I would find a few more out there. The trend is very positive. And this is not a meta. This is a systematic review. So I am only looking at whether or not it is beneficial, harmful, or some kind of a mixed outcome. And you can see there are next to no harmful outcomes associated with religion. Now, I would actually like to find some. That would really be a cool thing to find that religion causes harm. It would make me very famous. I have actually been praying about that. (Laughter.) God has not seen fit to answer that prayer. So if you believe in intercessionary prayer, that would be one thing that you could lift my way.

The basic news is this. The preliminary data seem to indicate that these programs are associated with benefit. Ready for Work is one example of something that you have heard about this conference. The President's Prisoner Reentry Initiative is another where we are just getting data in to look at. And, again, the task before us is a difficult one. And there are a lot of reasons why we don't have research. One of the

reasons why we don't have good research, there is plenty of blame to go around. And that is that the government has not encouraged it until recently. So that if you were to submit a proposal to do some kind of a study on a faith-based intervention in the past, it would be the kiss of death. That, thankfully, has changed a bit, but we still have a long ways to go. A lot of faith-based organizations, quite candidly, have not been open to be researched. Why would they need to be if they know they are already effective? And so there is a problem on both sides, but I think increasingly that is changing. A number of organizations are saying, "We know we are not perfect. We will offer someone to come in and take a look at us to tell us where our shortfalls are that you might be able to help us get those worked out through good, solid research." And that is a good thing to have. So the evidence is very preliminary but is positive. I am very confident about that. And then I think that is my last slide. That's it. Yes. I will just skip through this. That is where you can find more of our research if you would like to. And I am sure I will be back with you. Thank you. (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: Thank you. We are next going to have Bill Galston. Dr. William Galston is College Park professor at the University of Maryland and a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution. And, as I mentioned, he was also a leading light in setting policy for the Clinton administration. Thank you. (Applause.)

DR. GALSTON: Well, I have nine points to make in eight minutes. So I will have to hustle. (Laughter.)

Let me just begin by associating myself with the sentiment that Byron uttered at the end of his remarks. I remember when I walked into the White House, one of my first assignments was to serve on an interagency committee charged with reforming and expanding HeadStart. So the first thing I did was call over to HHS. And I said, "Would you pleas comb your files and send me all of the high-quality evaluation studies on HeadStart?" There was an embarrassed pause at the other end of the line. And my interlocutor said, "You know, there really aren't any." I said, "What? This program has been in existence for decades. It serves hundreds of thousands of kids. And you are telling me that we don't know whether it works or not?" I gradually learned through two and a half years of service in the White House that government at no level makes the kind of investment in evaluation or gives the kind of emphasis to evaluation that these very important programs that you and others are working on deserve and need. And I hope that on a bipartisan

basis we can change the way government does business so that we won't be flying as blind 25 years from now as we are today. (Applause.)

I stand before you not as a producer of research but as a consumer of research, including the research that the two gentlemen to my right, stage left for you, have been so instrumental in producing. So they do meta analyses, and I do summaries of their meta analyses. (Laughter.) And here is what I have come up with. I need these remarks to be sharp and intentionally challenging to some extent. I believe in these programs, but at the same time I think we need to be asking ourselves hard questions, even if others are not asking those questions.

So in the field, -- this is my first point -- the bright line distinctions between faith-based and secular social service agencies tend to blur to some extent. The stylized pictures in our heads don't conform perfectly to reality. There is a high degree of diversity in both of these broad categories. And it leads to a very substantial overlap, an overlap that is bound to affect the results of our evaluations. There are many differences right on the face of it. Let me just tick off some.

This will be my second point. There are pervasive differences in the sorts of staffing that these two different forms of organization tend to look for. Secular social service agencies emphasize credentials, official credentials, and faith-based and community organizations tend to emphasize fidelity to faith and to the mission of the organization. There is an emphasis in the one case on hard skills, let's say job skills, emphasis on the other soft skills and even personal transformation. There are differences in the duration of programs. Faith-based and community organizations tend to stick with people longer. There are distinctions in funding, categorical versus unrestricted. Surprisingly, a number of studies point in this direction.

Community, local faith-based organizations receive relatively little support from organized religious congregations. And they are dependent on public funds or fund-raising in the community at large. Let me just say that I haven't found much evidence to support the charge that local governments and agencies systematically discriminate against faith-based organizations, either in awarding funds or in making referrals.

Point three. And I address this to my democratic and liberal brethren. Contrary to the views of many civil libertarians, most faith-based organizations don't aggressively proselytize or even force clients to listen to faith-saturated messages. This restraint is not only constitutionally appropriate, but it is prudent because, as many researchers have pointed out, many clients have had experiences earlier in their lives that have made them wary of, if not right hostile to, organized religion.

Point number four. There is, as far as I can see from the literature, no systematic aversion to faith-based organizations on the part of public agencies responsible for referrals and programmatic recommendations. In fact, it appears to be an extensive informal network of relations among the staffs at the local level.

Five, contrary to widespread belief, many of the larger, more established, better funded, more diversified and internally specialized agencies, frequently referred to with the omnibus adjective "bureaucratic," in fact, tend to have close ties to their communities. And so I would caution against the easy picture in our heads suggesting that small faith-related groups are embedded in communities and larger organizations are not. The research, the case studies, the data do not bear out this generalization.

Six, and continuing on the theme of overlap among these two kinds of organizations, there appear not to be any systematic differences between secular and faith-based organizations in categories such as the motivation and conduct of their volunteers or in the question of whether they offer narrow versus holistic approaches to service delivery or in the way they define their goals and the way they recognize and celebrate success or, as I suggested earlier, in their efforts to evaluate their programs, which are underfunded and weak across the board.

Point number seven. It is not clear, at least on the basis of the literature that I have reviewed, that faith-based organizations systematically seek out and accept harder-to-serve populations. On the one hand, there are strong religious motivations to help the "least among us." On the other hand, a comprehensive study by Steven Rathgeb Smith and his colleagues suggest that faith-intensive programs tend to work better for clients who are highly motivated to succeed in them and that these programs seek out people with just such motivation.

Number eight, -- and here is where I will dovetail with what we just heard and join forces with it -- as yet, there is no systematic evidence that faith-based organizations deliver better outcomes across the board than do other kinds of organizations. Some do. Some don't. I will share with you my suspicion that if we convened this meeting in 20 years to review the latest generation of research, you will probably discover that generalizations will be hard to come by and that different kinds of organizations with different kinds of programs, different kinds of approaches, secular, religious, and others, are better at dealing with different population subgroups.

I very much doubt that we are going to find that one kind of program is systematically better than another, but I am going to raise the following issue. Is this the right question? Does it really matter so much

whether one category is better than the other or that they are roughly the same but it's a patchwork quilt of advantage and disadvantage? Does it really matter whether faith-based organizations are better or merely as good? I don't think so because the argument for involving them would be just as strong in either case. There are people who need help. There are people who want to help them. Right now the needs of those who need help are greater than what is available to help them. Hopefully your efforts have narrowed that gap. But there is more work to be done. And I think it is time to bring all hands on deck. Do I have one more minute, Karl?

This will be my final point. And I say this not only as a lifelong Democrat but as a lifelong observer of the political scene. As you know, one administration is coming to an end. There will be a new one. It may be of the same party. It may be of a different party. If these efforts are to continue and to be strong, it is going to be very important to create a sustainable consensus across party lines of the administrations. That means that it is particularly important that the mode of involvement in faith-based organizations can see and be constitutionally and legally appropriate. And in this connection, I would commend all of you a fine paper by two ranking scholars in this area, Ira Lupu and Robert Tuttle, both of George Washington University, both intimately involved with Dick Nathan's organization, who I think made a number of important points earlier today that everybody involved in this field should pay attention to. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: Thank you, Bill. We will finish up with Dick Nathan. And then we will have some time for questions, I believe, if you can start preparing those. Dr. Richard Nathan is the Director of the Rockefeller Institute of Government at the State University of New York, which is in Albany. He is also the senior statesman here with experience in government that dates back to the Johnson and Nixon administrations. (Applause.)

DR. NATHAN: Thank you, Karl. I am honored to be here. The title of this part of our program is "The Future of Innovation and Research." Knowing Jay Hein for a long time and admiring him and the people that are working with him, I know that has been his emphasis in the proceedings today and yesterday that there is a future, there are things to work on, innovations yet to come. The second part of the title is "The Future of Innovation and Research." That's my subject. And I am going to talk about research, and I am going to start with Byron and with Bill. In his major findings chart, the fourth point is rigorous research is long overdue,

Byron. And I am going to speak about some work that we are doing that is underway that I hope he will feel and others of you will feel is on the right track.

Let me start by saying just a little bit about who we are, providing support from the Pew Charitable Trust to Rockefeller Institute and our director of our roundtable on research and social policy. Chip Lupu and Bob Tuttle are partners of ours. They spoke earlier today. We have actively with the support of the future of the trust, when monitoring developments under the initiative and the learning that has occurred about the initiative and we have done some learning of our own and have produced some papers that are based on work that Bill mentioned, Steve Smith, people in our roundtable group have done. We have a handout about our research, research we have done and the research that we are doing. Claire Hughes, who is here today for The Roundtable -- stand up, Claire -- who is covering this event for us to put on our Web site, both of us have copies of a summary about work we have done in Michigan, in New York City, in Seattle, in Mississippi, and in a number of different fields. I want particularly to concentrate on the flagship study that we are conducting with the support of also the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Duke University Research Program in this field. We are conducting a random assignment rigorous study of drug treatment programs in a major American city with cooperation from universities and public officials to try to see how, why religion makes a difference. One of the things that we have done -- and this is something that Bill mentioned -- in phase one of this research, which we have already reported on, we have looked very closely at this point, that secular and sectarian social program providers often are similar people in secular programs often have very strong faith orientations. And you need, you need, to look at the groups.

This is my experience. I have worked in this field a long time with the studies of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. You need to know what the independent variable is. And that's just not to say it. You have to go out and meet the people and talk to the people at the front line and in the field, who their sponsors are, what their purposes are. And you have to sort out what religion is as an input to then look at how religion makes a difference as an output and an outcome. So we are now in phase two with random assignment. It takes time. Studies can often be very complicated to undertake. I am a strong believer that you can't do classical social experiments on everything. They take time. They cost a lot of money. They are difficult to do. You have to use them when you need them. This is a good case of where I hope our study 20 years from now will make Bill feel like somebody does know something, but we will be done before that, Bill. Now, what we are doing is looking at outcome variables and tracking what happens

to people in different types of programs based on our phase one research. And we are in the field, and we have all of the smart people who know about social experimentation helping us to avoid mistakes and do this carefully. The handout that we have describes that. There is more information to come. There is more information available from the Roundtable Web site. And so I think that I am proud to be able to tell you a little bit about that.

Now, I also agree with Bill Galston. When he said he had nine points, I started, Bill, to keep score. How many of those points am I okay on or do I agree with you on? I do okay, not great. But the first two points about diversity and differences, absolutely yes. And the point he made at the end, does it make a difference, you know, there is a role for a lot of different groups. Part of the question we ought to be thinking about and working on and considering what we can learn about different types of social program providers is how they should serve, who they serve, what kinds of people are most benefitted by involvement with the different kinds of groups. So this is not a matter of saying yea or nay. It is a matter of deep learning, rich and careful research in a place where it is important. This is a subject that we have been talking about for eight years. And we will see what happens next year. And it is obviously smoothing we ought to try to dig into and understand better in the way that Byron said in his work we followed. He has been very active in our program and in the way that Bill said. We need to try to find better answers, good answers. And, yet, we need to look at this as a question of who does what, what could we learn from understanding different treatments, different groups, different outcomes, different areas of social policy. I make my living that way. And, as Karl said, I have been at it a very long time. (Laughter.) (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: Can we take questions, Jay? Is it possible to take? We will take questions. I think I am going to start us here. We have about ten minutes left, it looks like. You know, I think it was a sociologist, Peter Burger, who once said that if the most irreligious people in the world are the Swedes and the most religious people in the world are from India, you could describe America as a nation of Indians ruled by Swedes. (Laughter.)

You know, it does sometimes seem that there is a stark disconnect between the faithfulness of our citizens, of our people versus the insistence we often get from many elites that our public life should be entirely secular. This is a very weird disconnect, some of us feel, at least. I remember a survey came out a few years ago that was a survey of graduate students. And it showed that among white Americans with a graduate degree, four out of ten had "intensely antagonistic views towards Christians." And when there isn't

open hostility, there is at least often a kind of neglect or kind of blindness about a religion. As we have heard, the academics often are strangely silent or ignore, skip over religious influences on human conditions. And I have to think that maybe there is more to that than just they weren't funded or nobody thought of the question yet. So I guess I want to start by asking our panelists, you know, given the many hints we have that religion can perhaps be a powerful force on health and prosperity and happiness and so forth and given that apparently many of our citizens understand that power and want to work with it, I am wondering if we can come up with some ideas as to why many American elites so often seem anxious to ignore or shun religion as a social force and put themselves in a very different position than rank and file voters.

DR. B. JOHNSON: Do you want to tackle that one?

DR. NATHAN: You start out, and I'll follow you.

DR. B. JOHNSON: Well, Karl, what if I take an easier question than that one? (Laughter.) You kind of set me up on that one again, didn't you? (Laughter.)

Well, one of the things that I want to mention, I agree with Dick's and Bill's comments on the nature of this research. One of the things that strikes me is that when I lived in Philadelphia, you could get a vastly different picture of the Salvation Army's drug treatment program from one site in town to the other. And it points to your question that not only are there gray lines. Some of these organizations that are very much similar are, in fact, different. We had a grant this last year where we were an intermediary for the Department of Justice. And we founded 39 programs. It as a domestic violence intervention program. And 13 were faith-based. And the remaining were community-based. Once we brought those people together, you couldn't pick them out because a lot of people that worked in the community-based programs were indeed very religious people and quite outspoken about that. And when you labeled them as a community-based group, they were somewhat offended because their faith was important to them, like it is for most Americans. And so as we began to think about research, it would be very helpful for us to be able to take these kinds of distinctions, to look at these organizations, a little bit more closely. But going back to your question, Karl, the reality is most Americans are religious. All the survey research seems to indicate that. But it also indicates that people are religious in different ways. And so there is a great diversity in

American religion that we really haven't fully appreciated because most of our surveys ask this question, do you believe in God or do you pray? Most people are very comfortable answering that in the affirmative, but then when you break that out and ask them more questions on religion, then you find out that there are some real sharp differences between us. I think some of that has worked its way into the elite and people that typically tend to be in powers of leadership. And certainly within the academic community, we see a lot of a different picture than we see among everyday people. DR. NATHAN: I can tell a story that picks up on what Byron said and what Karl asked. I find -- and I have been always very interested and motivated to do this -- Yogi Berra said the best way to observe something is to go look at it (Laughter.)

DR. NATHAN: I spend a lot of my time -- I have just spent two weeks in the field in Tallahassee and in St. Paul studying health policy program systems. You have to get out and talk to people that in a way is the independent variable. So I am now still a researcher. I was in New Jersey, and I was talking to a woman in a social service office. And I said, "Well, you know, that's interesting what you do, but, now, what about these faith-based programs? What do they do? And why is it different?" She got very annoyed with me. She said, "I am devoutly religious. It motivates everything I do. It influences everything I think about and care about in working with the people that are clients. I am not different. That is something that I carry and care about." So this point about who is out there and how important it is to be clear in our understanding, Karl, of the agents of change, we have a paper on our Web site by John Greene. And it is a new paper, a new congregation study. And this is a challenge for you, Jay. What it shows is that the message is getting out, but it is a hard message to use to reach a lot of small particularly congregations. So there are not only different players, but you need to know what their base is and what their capability is and their world view is to try to get their involvement in the way that has been worked on so vigorously in your work and in the work of the faith-based initiative. The faith-based initiative, we also did a paper on this. What is most distinctive about what President Bush did is he penetrated the government. He sent people into the agencies and said, "Try and do this." That is distinctive. And I am impressed by the fact that they did it. And I have learned a lot about how they did it. (Applause.)

We are out there. And we are doing our final report now. We are finishing up this work. It ends this year. And we are going to look in this final report on this -- we call it administrative presidency, digging into the bureaucracy, trying to change the signals on the ground. It is a challenge. There is more work to be done. (Applause.)

DR. GALSTON: Well, Karl, I am going to pick up your challenge. And without denying the statistics on the relationship between what some people have called over-education and attitudes towards religion, although by that standard everybody on this platform probably is "over-educated," what I do want to suggest is that that doesn't map as neatly as many people suppose onto partisanship and onto religious elites. And I will just speak from my personal experience. Just about the first assignment that I got from the President when I walked into the White House was, you know, a charge to make sure that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act made it to the finish line in good order. And we worked very hard on that. Two years later, the White House and the Department of Education worked very hard in conjunction with lots and lots of religious groups to clarify and, by clarifying, to expand the dimensions of clearly permissible religious activity and religious expression in public schools. A year after that, President Clinton did not oppose; indeed, he welcomed, the charitable choice provision of the Welfare Reform Act, which he signed I was a senior adviser to Al Gore's presidential campaign and played some role in Vice President Gore's decision to strongly endorse the expansion of charitable choice, which he did, if memory serves, in a speech to the Salvation Army in 1999. I could go on, but what I want to suggest is -- and I think this is good news as we move into an election year -- that there is a whole lot more consensus, the basic building blocks, not every detail but the basic building blocks, of what so many people in this room have spent so much of their lives doing. And that is good news. I think we ought to recognize it and celebrate it. (Applause.

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: It looks like we can take one question. Forgive me. I don't know the mechanics, but is there somebody who -- is there a microphone out there somewhere? Can you just holler?

PARTICIPANT: (Question off microphone)

(Applause.)

DR. B. JOHNSON: Some of those studies that were reported on the health outcomes are, in fact, of people on the ground doing programs through local congregations, for example. So some of that has already happened. And there is a whole health literature that deals with religion and spirituality. And a lot of it is very applied. And so there is a lot of good work happening among congregations that connect, for example,

diabetes to interventions on the faith-based side. So a lot of that translating has already happened. One of the problems with presenting so much all at once is when you throw 500 studies at people, you lose a lot in the translation.

DR. NATHAN: My personal mantra is to be a social scientist who works on studies that are useful and used, action research. And I stand alone in my business. No. Almost. (Laughter.)

It worries me. It worries me. Your question is a good one, that we need to do things that can inform and provide knowledge, informs the policy process. It doesn't matter what I think. We have got lots of politicians. It is not my values and my purposes that matter. It is to try to get the kind of deep understanding that can permit policy-makers, help policy-makers to make. As I said at the end of my comments, it is not a matter of either/or, religion works, religion doesn't. It is a matter of for whom and how and in what kinds of settings should different kinds of groups do things to deal with the toughest problems in the society, the under-class top problems, long-term dependency, compassion for the people who are really hurting and needing.

PANEL MODERATOR ZINSMEISTER: That strikes me as a very good last word. Thank you all. (Applause.)

DR. NATHAN: If anybody wants our handout, I have got some copies for you.

PANEL II: THE FUTURE OF INNOVATION IN COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

PANEL MODERATOR MEDEFIND: All right. I would like to invite our final panel to come on up. While they are coming up, let's take a quick stretch break just to stretch your legs. So this will be just two minutes, but go ahead and stand up. If you want to give your neighbor a shoulder rub, that is permissible.

We have covered a lot of territory over the last two days. And hopefully you will be ruminating over this for the next couple of weeks. And chew on everything you heard. This final panel is going to be looking forward, entirely looking forward, in a lot of ways. As we have talked about, as you have heard hopefully over and over again, there has been a lot of very, very significant things that have happened over the last seven and a half years. And a big part of that has been what we call the leveling of the playing field for

faith-based groups. And so we have talked about that, about welcoming faith-based groups as equal partners. And that has profoundly changed the way that government approaches these types of issues.

We have also talked about shifting the way that government addresses need from very large and distant and bureaucratic to making it small and local and personal in a way that never had happened before. In a lot of ways, as we have talked about, really, at the heart of this vision is saying the government simply cannot address the most pressing issues that we face alone. And it will always be more effective when government brings what strengths it does have and draws together along with that small local groups, large nonprofits, secular groups that perhaps have no official religious tie but are just motivated by passion, religious groups that are completely committed to things because of their faith and driven by those things. We need all of those players if we are going to be serious about solving addiction problems, homelessness problems, malaria in Africa, and all of those things. And so what we are really emphasizing is that ultimately we need every player. And that is the effective way to engage things in the years to come. And this ultimately, as we have said many times, is not a Washington story. It is fundamentally a story about communities, about states, about municipalities, about local communities drawing together each of the best players in their area and working together to address the need.

And so for this last panel, what we are going to be doing is looking forward to various models that are happening all across the country to do just that, bringing together key players in an area and to engage these needs. And so, first of all, we are going to hear from Jannah Scott. Jannah works in Arizona for the Governor's Faith and Community Initiative, a Democratic governor, Janet Napolitano. They have their own initiative, and they are particularly focused on working with states to help advance this vision. Jannah is an amazing person. So please welcome Jannah Scott.

MS. SCOTT: Thank you. (Applause.) Thank you, Jedd. I want to just take a moment of my eight minutes to really thank Jay and Jedd and Elizabeth and all of the White House staff for their great support of this initiative, especially over the last two years. I feel like in 2006, it was as if an eagle landed on Jackson Street and its wings spread over all 50 states. And the pragmatism, Jay, and the support and the encouragement that you and Jedd and Elizabeth and all your staff bring on behalf of the President, I just want you to know we really appreciate that. (Applause.)

I don't know if any of my other state liaison colleagues are here. There are 35 of us across the state. And if they are here, -- I see a couple of Minnesotans still here -- I would just like to ask them to stand

because these are your people in state government who are really seeking to open doors at the state level and the local level to continue this initiative into the future. (Applause.)

We have Lee, Lee from Minnesota, another lady here from Utah. And there are still about 20 of us here. So I want you to know we are really interested in this. On behalf of Governor Napolitano, I just want to congratulate all the nonprofits who are here and to really say to you that if she were here today, she would congratulate you herself because, truly, you are the warriors of the armies of compassion that we hear the President and others speak about so much because, surely, many of you have had to war over the last seven years to really keep this thing going in local communities. And so we appreciate you for that.

I think as we come to a completion of seven years and the eighth year being new beginnings, it is only appropriate that we would end this conference talking about the future of the initiative. In Arizona, our motto is "Many Lands, Many Peoples, Many Faiths, One Arizona." And I think one of the most important issues that we have to face and we really should embrace is that the diversity of the faith community in the United States really encourages us to reach out to all faiths and to really connect them with our nonprofit what people like to call secular sectors, who really represent the infrastructure and the foundation of local communities. I think, as we are seeing in some states, particularly Arizona, we have been suffering some economic woes because of foreclosure prevention, rising gas prices, and things like that, that this sector is going to be more and more critical in the days and years to come. And so we look at not so much faith-based or community-based but, as the President has entitled this initiative, faith-based and community-based, working together.

I just want to share a little bit about the Arizona initiative and to say to you that, as we had developed this initiative in Arizona, we looked at it in terms of where we started in 2005. We were, as I said, the 33rd state to come on board. And when we started, we came in on the heels of Hurricane Katrina. And so our first involvement in this was to engage over 850 unaffiliated groups with the Arizona voluntary organizations active in disaster and to really get those groups connected with the longstanding groups like the Catholics, like the Lutherans, like the United Methodists, the Salvation Army, American Red Cross, people who had been doing that work for decades and in the case of the Red Cross for a century, and really allowing them to partner with those groups to get the work done.

As we have also worked on several other efforts, we have initiated this idea of a municipal initiative. It includes counties, too, but it is kind of convoluted to say municipal and county initiative. So we just call it the municipal initiative. It wasn't really started out of the governor's office, but it has been

expanded as a result of the 2007 White House conference on faith and community initiatives that took place in Arizona. This initiative really started about ten years ago in the City of Phoenix, which, of course, is the largest city in the state, and in Maricopa County. Right now we have the potential to reach 90 cities and towns, 15 counties, and grateful for the involvement of the potential for 22 sovereign nations. To go through these quickly, this initiative is operating under the leadership of the Governor's Council on Faith and Community Initiatives. And it is chaired by one of the city's liaisons, the deputy chief of staff out of Phoenix mayor's office. One of our most critical partners to this is the Arizona League of Cities and Towns. Each state has a league connected to the national league. And they then give us entrance to all the mayors, the city councils, and in some cases connections to counties. Our partners also include businesses, faith-based and community organizations, of course. And, interestingly, the legislative chaplaincy has gotten into this to keep our legislators apprised of all that we are looking to do.

So, quickly, just how does it flow? It can be either initiated by an elected or an appointed official, a grass roots faith-based or community group, a business initiative, or a family concern rising to levels of influence. I just want to share how some of them have started. I will skip over that one for the sake of time. Right now we have 17 entities in various stages in the pipeline of the initiative, which started May of 2007, 8 we call operational, which basically means they have a functioning initiative, their elected official is involved, and they are doing something in one of the several issue areas that we speak about. We have four that are emerging. We have five that are promising. I want to talk about three of them, in particular, just quickly. The City of Phoenix's initiative was actually initiated by the concern for the business community to clean up the downtown area as they were about to go through some major redevelopment. But they knew enough, the business leaders, to partner with faith-based and community groups around the issue of homelessness. They brought the county to the table, the state Housing Department to the table, other cities to the table. And they were able over a long period of time with the help of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to leverage about \$25 million to build a campus of care for the homeless. And it is really a great example of all of the sectors working together but initiated by a business concern. The faithbased and community groups really are the foundation for that effort now, although there is still state and local involvement in terms of funding and federal involvement.

Another one I quickly want to talk about is the Town of Buckeye initiative, which was actually started by their chief of police. Buckeye is one of the fastest growing cities in the State of Arizona, possibly in the nation. Their police chief was concerned about the potential for crime. And he saw the ability of the

faith-based groups to actually help prevent crime by reaching out to various people as they were coming into the town and by establishing programs that would help the young people as well as that would help for Block Watch and things like that.

Since then Buckeye has moved into the area of emergency preparedness. And they are our first city, actually, in the state to fund a faith-based intermediary. The third one I want to mention is Graham County. It is a rural county up in northeastern Arizona. Actually, three counties and the town have gotten together around the issues of the elderly and the youth. It was inspired by a grass roots faith-based group that really wanted to make sure that the towns were leveraging to the fullest potential possible the voluntary efforts that faith-based and community groups can provide. If I had more time, I could share with you some really interesting stories about all of these, but I do want to just as you look at the last slide, which is the list of some of the issues that we are involved in. And that turned from a bullet to an H. So that is interesting. (Laughter.)

I do want to say that one of the things that we appreciate most, you know, the Faith-Based and Community Initiative has reminded me so often of that movie Basic that John Travolta was in and Samuel L. Jackson, where at the beginning there was so much confusion about what actually had gone on, it was a war scene, but by the end of the movie, you realize as things began to get uncovered that it was really a good thing that was going on. And the line in the movie that I remember so well was "You've got to get the story right." And I think that Jay and his staff have done a phenomenal effort in getting this story right so that the future of the initiative, I believe, is very bright. Thank you. (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR MEDEFIND: Excellent. That list with the H's there was the very portrait of what this is. It's, you know, although there have been side shows and debates about church-state issues and funding issues, those things are significant, but ultimately this is a problem-solving strategy and saying we can be more effective when we approach things differently.

Well, if it is a problem-solving strategy that is working at the federal level, if you hear it is working at the state level, it is working at the municipal level, it also makes sense that others would take that strategy on, too. And so we are going to hear now from a representative of the private sector, CVS Corporation. Olivia Biggs is going to be actually standing in for Steve Wing. And she is going to be talking about a partnership that CVS took on as a problem-solving strategy working closely with front-line nonprofits to address a particular challenge that they as a corporation faced in partnership with the Department of Labor

but led initially by CVS and working in partnership with local groups. So please welcome Olivia Biggs. (Applause.)

MS. BIGGS: I bring you greetings on behalf of Steve Wing. He sends his best regard. He could not be here today due to the illness of his wife. So we just want to keep him in our thoughts and our prayers. I am truly honored to represent him today. We are so excited about the faith-based and community initiatives all across the country. And we have been asked by the Committee to actually talk about why FBOs and community-based organizations were uniquely equipped to meet the needs of CVS Pharmacy and how we built our projects around that.

One thing that our company has found out over the years in being very aggressive with this nation's workforce investment initiatives is that it goes beyond the deficiency in skills development. Many of the issues that we see in our potential candidates are those really about making the right choices. It is about values. It is about having the right mindset to be successful at work. So because of the sensitivity of our faith-based organizations and their willingness to work with us, we were able to create some excited partnership all across the country. And, by the way, we have an HR strategy to work with these organizations. So we welcome your support.

I was also asked to talk a little bit about how do we do that. Well, first of all, it began with a commitment, a commitment from our top leadership that we would work with faith-based and community organizations and not only to top-level leadership. It also took training for some of the faith-based organizations, who were not accustomed to working with business. Because of our fine leadership at CVS, we were able to meet with those organizations and in many instances train them on how to, in fact, work with business. Another important factor of this, again, I must mention, it was the leadership. It is the focus and the vision of that faith-based organization that you care enough about the people you serve to align your organization with business. And that is where the rubber meets the road. I would just like to leave you today with a couple of tips in doing that because there are some fundamental strategies in working with business that I want to share with you today that Steve also had asked me to provide.

First of all, the alignment of your organization's goals and objectives to the business goals is very, very important. Most businesses, corporations, we're in business to make profit. Therefore, your programs that you put together for your people, design their HR strategy. Make sure that it can, in fact, save that business partner time or the cost of doing business. That is so critical.

Secondly, make sure that you meet with the decision-makers. Oftentimes we lose a lot of time because we meet with the wrong people. We want to make sure that we meet with the right decision-makers, be aware of the authority of the person that you're dealing with. He or she may not have the power to cut the deal. I can being a job developer many, many years ago. And, actually, it took me months to get some of the major corporations. But I put them in my tickler file, and I just never forgot about that target. So, again, we just want to encourage you to make sure that you talk with the right decision-makers. And also be patient. Be patient. Movement sometimes in the business world can be very, very slow. Give them the business cycle. So the decision-making processes can take much longer than you think. And we are very, very fortunate at CVS Pharmacy. Our CEO actually created a department to work with these types of initiatives. So while CVS is able to turn things around a little quicker, often sometimes in working with other businesses, they may not have that department available. And also remember equitable partnerships are important. Your negotiator will often have to explain what they are getting out of the partnership and what you are putting in. Be careful not to over-commit, not to over-commit for your potential candidates of employment. It's okay to start small. It's okay to start small and to grow that program and, in addition to making sure that that HR strategy is aligned with the employment training goals of the organization.

And last, but not least, competition is the game. Play is a part of the game. Before you approach that organization, make sure that you know who the major players are, who the competitors are on the business end of it because they would want to know who those competitors are. And, in closing, for long-term success, we leave you with attract the business community to work with you. Do not be afraid to sell your program. Make sure that you understand your employer's needs. Make the best match possible. Our motto with workforce initiatives is that we know that they are diamonds in the rough. It is a matter of us just working together to find those diamonds. Also remember to monitor the employer's satisfaction in your candidate's performance and provide ongoing support that will take your partnership to the next level. And last, but not least, make no small plans for they have no power to stir up the soul. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR MEDEFIND: If you are interested in actually knowing more about the specifics of that partnership between CVS and local FBCOs and the Department of Labor, that and many other pieces of research are actually going to be on that HHS Web site that you learned about. CVS has filled thousands and thousands of jobs by working with local nonprofit partners that have the capacity to identify people,

help them place in jobs, and then walk with them to help them succeed in those jobs. And so that is one great example there of a very effective partnership between private sector, nonprofits, and government.

Well, let's look now at a very different set of challenges, moving from a corporation's interest in getting quality employees that will continue working with them for an extended period of time to a community that has been devastated by floods in Hurricane Katrina. Hal Roark leads the Broadmoor community development organization that is helping lead that type of networking bringing together every willing partner in the Broadmoor neighborhood of New Orleans. I heard him speak in New Orleans about a month or two ago. Actually, a few weeks ago I received a phone call from a writer who asked me. He said, "I am writing a book on passion, and I want to identify some people around the country whom you would say have particular passion for things." I said, "Well, one guy you should talk to is Hal Roark. He has a passion for his neighborhood. He loves it, and he is rebuilding it with a whole lot of great people." So here is Hal to tell you about that. (Applause.)

MR. ROARK: Good afternoon, everybody. It is great to be here with you. In fact, I called my wife yesterday after I was here and sitting in the back, like many of you, and taking notes. And I called my wife later. She said, you know, "How is the conference going?" I said, "You are not going to believe this, but the President was speaking today." And, you know, it's just official after official after official. I have to tell you it has been an enormously long road to go from Broadmoor to the White House. And I mean that spiritually, emotionally, psychologically. Never in my wildest dreams did I ever imagine that I would be at a place like this representing -- (Applause.) Thank you. -- the people of my neighborhood in New Orleans. (Applause.) Thank you. I'm just an average guy. I'm not a government official. I was a small business owner pre-Katrina. And what I am here to do, really, this afternoon is be a demonstration of the power of what these partnerships can do because I think it is very, very clear when you see the outcomes and the challenges we have had. We have had enormous challenges. And the outcomes are equally successful. So let's get into it, and let's show you a little bit about what these are. My neighborhood is 7,000 people, 2,400 buildings. If you look at the whole City of New Orleans and you kind of go south a little bit, that southernmost tip that's in kind of the bay there of the Mississippi River as it drips, that is my entire neighborhood. All 7,000 people, all 2,400 buildings get wet. I live in Broadmoor. My house gets seven feet of water. All of this was displaced from the storm. And you can see some photos of some of the things that happened and what it caused. The damage was pretty horrific. Things were picked up and moved. Do you remember

seeing those photos where you saw -- I got a call from a buddy of mine in California, who said, "I'm seeing the strangest thing. I'm seeing a house on fire in water. How is that possible?" And I said, "I don't really know. Is it my house?" (Laughter.)

You know, you go home. And what happens is the water picks things up. It moves things. My refrigerator on my first floor was actually in the living room. It picks up gas water heaters and dryers and moves them. And what happens is when you move that and say it's a gas dryer and it moves, it breaks the gas bond. The utility company turns the service off. And when they turn it back on again, it can often spark. And the whole house goes up. And so the amount of damage has been truly huge and surprising. Here is the real world challenge. Okay? You're in my shoes. You're in our shoes, the 7,000 of us in Broadmoor. You want to come back. You want to rebuild. Some people did not want to rebuild. That was eight percent of the neighborhood. Ninety-two percent wanted to come back. Real world. What are you going to do? Every government building in Broadmoor destroyed, the roads destroyed, 7,000 people displaced, 2,400 buildings destroyed, public school destroyed, local library destroyed, every tree my wife and I -- my business is pre-Katrina. We were in real estate. We had seven rental properties. Every tree and bush died on all the properties. We lost thousands of trees in Broadmoor alone because it wasn't just water in that water. There was some nasty stuff, 2,000 cars lost with gasoline and motor oil and other things in the water. Real world. How are you going to come back?

Our challenge wasn't just to sit up and say, "Fix it for us. Do it for us." Quite frankly -- and I mean no disrespect speaking at a White House conference because they actually would be buying into the same flaws we do -- we did not believe that government was going to solve all of our problems for us, nor did we want government to solve all the problems for us. Now, you want that in a way emotionally, right? You want someone else to take care of it for you. But the real world is the problems are so huge and complex that that is not going to happen. And so we developed a phrase, which was, "We have to be the cavalry we want to see coming over the hill because if we don't do this for ourselves, no one is going to do it for us." But you have to develop a strategy to do that. And our strategy was partnerships. And we said very clearly - and these are the six petals of the partnership -- we believe these six groups for everything we do will look to partner with us to solve our problems. First and foremost, it is going to be citizen-driven. What I have not mentioned so far is that our neighborhood was slated to be destroyed. There was an outside group of urban planners that came into the city, into the state, made recommendations to the city. And they said our

neighborhood should literally be mowed down with bulldozers and destroyed. Now, we have a word for that in Broadmoor. We call that a "really bad day." (Laughter.)

And so the experts come in. It doesn't matter that a third of us is a nationally historic neighborhood. When they want to mow you down, that is a really bad day. We rebelled because we said, "Look, we are the world experts on Broadmoor. We know it better than anybody else. We know the issues in terms of crime and drugs and streets and traffic and all the rest. If you want to know what the problems are and solutions are, at least we should be involved at the table. "We're not saying that we know urban planning as well as urban planners. We recognize and need their competency. But we know this neighborhood. We know this patch of dirt better than anybody." And, frankly, in the Twenty-First Century, what this Office of the White House has so perfectly right is that in the Twenty-First Century, government will not be the sole solution to problems. (Applause.)

It can't be. I mean just think of this practically. It cannot be. And the reason why is because universities have expertise; corporations have expertise; and, frankly, residents have expertise for these social problems that concern us. I mean, listen to all of the things that we have been hearing about for the last two days: HIV, prisoner reentry, homelessness. These are problems which the people that are affected by it have real person interest with being involved. And the more we can involve the folks affected, the greater the social capital that can come out of it and, frankly, the better the solutions. So what we said was we're always going to look at involving residents, universities, faith communities explicitly, private sector, government, and developers. And what I want to do is show you three quick examples of the real outcomes we have produced in our neighborhood as a result of that.

The citizen involvement in the Keller Library has been our Broadmoor Improvement Association Keller Library Committee. Schools have been M.I.T., Bard, Harvard, the Accounting School of Simon's Rock, and then local schools, actually, from D.C.'s National Cathedral School and St. Albans heard about us. And their kids raised books and had a book drive and sent them to us. Faith communities: St. Columbus, the Episcopal diocese of Quincy, the Jewish youth groups. Private sector, we have CH2M Hill, Rosa Mary Foundation, the Keller Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, AT&T, Mercy Corps, Officer Recovery Management, New Orleans Public Library Board. Developers: Eskew, Dumez, and Ripple. The bottom line here on this library project is we in that partnership have raised over \$3 million to turn that library from an old-fashioned library to a new Twenty-First Century library that is digital, that is interactive, that is focusing on workforce development, and that can be a meeting place for us as we come back.

Example number two, Wilson School. We had a school that was such a poor performing public school I honestly could not tell you what the name of the school was when we moved in. My wife was a public school teacher. Most of the public school teachers in New Orleans don't send their kids to public schools because they were pre-Katrina such poorly performing public schools. I'm telling you it's bizarre for a developer to move into a neighborhood and not even look at the public school. Think about it where you come from home. Public schools are one of the things that drive property values in communities. Not to even consider it is a major statement about how bad things were. One of the first things we did when we got control of our neighborhood was to say, "We are going to eliminate the public school and create our own charter school." And we did. That involved again citizens of Broadmoor, Charter School Board, Bard, Harvard, different faith communities, private sector, government. The bottom line is we have raised through different areas, including green groups, over \$20 million to bring that school back as a cutting-edge school that is also going to include the YMCA meeting room place, think community hub center for the elderly and kids. You know, you have got a school that is a huge asset. Why aren't we using that on weekends and nights? Why aren't we doing other things for our youth? Why aren't we using the gym to empower people?

And why aren't we doing whatever, frankly, the community says it wants out of the community school, yoga classes, ESL classes? That is the vision. The third example is a partnership created between my organization, the Broadmoor Development Corporation. Now, by the way, don't be too impressed by the coat and tie because that's not what I usually wear. And, truthfully, we are a small organization of only three people. Okay? I have been talking with folks who are here. Many of you are also small nonprofits wondering, how does this stuff apply to us? We are less than two years that we have been around, and we only have a full-time staff of three. We are very, very small. And our challenges are great. And if we can pull these partnerships together, you can pull these partnerships together. This last partnership is a great example between my organization, which got a grant from the Surdna Foundation to hire case managers that go out into the fields, visit people in the FEMA trailers and their homes to find out what their needs are. A local Episcopal church called the Church of the Annunciation evicted themselves from their own second story dorm unit offices, created a dorm space for 100 people, where they can house and feed 100 folks at a time. And then we work with Rebuilding Together, which is a national organization. Habitat is better known, but Habitat uses volunteers to do new construction. And we don't have any new construction at Broadmoor. It is all renovation of existing buildings. And so Rebuilding Together is the better national partner for us. I am pleased to say that we have over 100 kids with us this week. We have over ten houses being renovated

right now with our volunteers identified by my case manager. And they are also working with Rebuilding Together. And the outcome o that is that of the 73 neighborhoods of New Orleans, we're leading the recovery at 72.3 percent. If you look at the yellow and orange -- (Applause.)

Thank you. If you look at the yellow and the orange, that represents properties and their damage. And what we are looking at here as it moves to green is that they are properties in full recovery. Over 3 million for Killer, 25 million for Wilson, the Broadmoor, the BIA, the Broadmoor Improvement Association, Annunciation, Rebuilding Together partnership generates over 3 million a year in volunteer labor, especially from faith communities and university kids that come down and help us. If I could leave you with two tips, the tip number one is this of why we have been successful. It is not our size. It is not our longevity. We are a brand new group. Number one, I would be really clear about who you are and what your vision is. People want to support -- and I heard this echoed in the comments from CVS. People want to align themselves with people that share their vision and values. So be really clear about what you believe. If you have a faith community stance, don't water that down because people want to partner with you and be with you because of that stance.

And then the last thing is, make it easy for people to help you. As a final note, just as a story, we literally have 101 kids this week at our facility working with us on homes. And we have eight Broadmoorians this week that went with the church invitation. They are members also. They are in Quincy today filling sand bags and working with those folks who have been displaced by the flood. It is not because we are done. We still have 28 percent of Broadmoor that we need to get out of FEMA trailers and back in their homes, but, frankly, for those who whom much has been given, much is required. And we are giving back already to help other people who have been displaced by the flood because we are uniquely qualified to understand how painful that is. And it is just an honor to be here to represent what we are doing. Thank you. (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR MEDEFIND: Thank you, Hal. All right. For our last speaker, we are going to go back to the states. And so we kind of have bookended this session starting with an A state, Arizona, down to the southern end of things, led by a Democratic governor. Now we're going to go to the northern end of things with Alaska, led by a Republican governor. Scott Merriner is -- actually, you have got to look at his bio. It is one of the more fascinating ones I have seen there. B.A. from Harvard, Rhodes scholar, Oxford, analyst with the CIA, management consultant for McKinsey, but then also a commercial fisherman in the Bering

Sea and big game guide. So what else can he possibly do? Well, he is also a pastor, and he is a co-chair of Alaska Governor's Advisory Council on the Faith-Based and Community Initiative. And so he is going to give us a little window into what the vision is looking like there in the hinterlands of the north. (Applause.)

MR. MERRINER: Thank you for that introduction. I wish you hadn't told them I'm a pastor because now they're all thinking, "Oh, no. You've given the last person speaking the microphone, and he's a pastor. We're in real trouble." (Laughter.)

Well, it is an honor to be here. And I do bring you a warm welcome from your colleagues who, just like you, are working every day to mobilize the armies of compassion to meet real needs in our neighborhoods and in our cities and in our states. And, you know, Alaska was quick to jump on the band wagon of this vision that President Bush rolled out. In 2002, the then governor, lieutenant governor, asked me to chair a task force that would look into this. We recommended the creation of an office, which happened in January 2005. And a lot of work has gotten done, and it needed to because although I am extremely proud of our state, there is something I am not that proud of. And that is the fact that if you look across the basket of social indicators, you would be familiar with all of them. And you would do kind of a weighted average. Alaska is at the bottom of the list with the least healthy communities overall of any of our 50 states. So although I am proud to say we were quick to jump on this initiative, it is really because we had to.

But you know what? So does every state because none of the social indicators are acceptable anywhere in our country, not here in D.C., not in Guam, and not in Anchorage, Alaska. We have real people who have real needs. I am excited about this topic that we are doing in our panel here, "The Future of Innovative Community Partnerships," because I do believe that what we have been doing in Alaska has some unique applications for this topic. The mission statement of the Alaska Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiative -- let me read the statement to you. It says, "The office will improve the well-being of Alaskans by strengthening and expanding the contributions of faith-based and community initiatives." And it lists three ways it will do this. The first one is this, "By fostering partnerships between and among government, faith, and community groups." So innovative community partnerships has been the top priority of the office now for several years. We have learned a lot about this. I have only got a couple of minutes. So what I want to do today is not give you lots of detail about any specific model. I will give a few examples. I want to give you three kind of big conclusions that I have taken away about innovative

community partnerships and then kind of one over-arching implication certainly for us in Alaska, but I think, really, for all of us around the country in every state.

The first conclusion is this. Innovative community partnerships are possible. They are. I will give you an example. Last year the office in Alaska helped launch a new program in Anchorage, which is our largest city, they call Homeless Connect. Now, Homeless Connect is a one-day event held twice a year. And it involves virtually every organization in the city that touches the population groups. Let me read you some of the outcomes of the first one we held last July. "Over 300 homeless participants were served by 35 different public, private, and nonprofit, both faith-based and secular, service providers. "Twenty-three percent of participants were heads of households with children under 18. Ninety-four people received housing information, 53 completing housing applications. "Twenty-eight substance abuse and mental health screenings were given; 22 HIV tests completed; 255 bags of groceries handed out; 75 showers provided; 60 haircuts given; 15 TB tests, which is a huge issue in Alaska. "Forty-five appointments were made for additional health care services. And 56 received employment referrals," all of that in one day in a city of only 250,000 people. (Applause.)

Nothing like it had ever happened before. That is a remarkable, remarkable outcome, transformational, in fact. Innovative community partnerships are possible. Secondly, they are essential. They are not optional. And the reason is this. The biggest challenges we face in our communities, the great human needs that we have been talking about here the past two days, homelessness, substance abuse, at-risk youth, et cetera, they are not going to be solved any other way. They just aren't. It has been said by others already today, but because I am a pastor, perhaps I can be even a little more blunt. Government and secular philanthropists who believe that they can solve these problems without enlisting the aid of faithbased organizations are living in fantasy land. They really are. (Applause.) MR. MERRINER: They need the help of the tens of millions of Americans who are motivated to do so by their faith. But it works both ways as well. Faith leaders can live in a fantasy land also, believing that somehow they can make innovative transformational contributions to the greatest needs in their community withou partnering with government and secular organizations. Now, I am here to tell you that is not possible. If faith leaders truly desire to contribute to transformational change, they can't avoid partnership with government and secular organizations. The fact that these innovative community partnerships are essential has been made crystal clear to me this last year as we have made solving the challenges of Alaska's foster care system our number one priority. You know, addressing the needs of foster kids in a foster system, it's massively

important for Alaska, but one of the things I've learned in my research this year is it is actually pretty darned important for about every one of our states. Foster kids are -- (Applause.)

Yes, that is worthy applause. Here is what I have learned after a year of workshops and meetings and nationwide research. I have two things abundantly clear. Firstly, the only way that our state can ever hope to provide even minimally acceptable experience for the thousands of children that it takes into custody each year is to enlist the untapped resources of the faith communities, which are staggering and which is the only resource pool possibly big enough to close that gap. In fact, here is what is remarkable. I estimate that if just the top ten largest churches in our state really made this a priority, we could completely close all of the gaps in our foster care delivery system, just the top ten churches. (Applause.)

That's clear, but so is a second thing. If faith leaders in Alaska want to make that kind of transformational difference in our state and in our foster children, they must be willing to partner deeply with government organizations and secular organizations that are also serving that same group of kids. Now, are these partnerships common? No. We wish. Do they require creativity and innovation? Absolutely. But are they optional? Absolutely not. They are essential if we want to create the kind of America whose future is brighter than the past and the present. But it is not just going to happen by itself. And it leads me to my third conclusion. Innovative community partnerships are hard work. They are difficult to create. They are difficult to sustain, even when you think they should be easy. I learned that a couple of years ago as we tried to tackle one of the other great issues in Alaska, which is rural suicide rates many times higher than the national average. It gets a lot of attention in Alaska in the media. And there are a lot of resources, federal money, state money, tribal money, and people working hard to reduce the unacceptable rate of teen suicide in our rural communities. I thought to myself, this one is a no-brainer because as soon as we looked at it, we realized, my goodness. All of these teams go out and do workshops of suicide prevention around the state. They're flying to these towns and villages. Then when there is a suicide, they fly teams in to deal with the crisis in the days afterwards. But here is what we realized. They completely ignored the fact that in every single village and town, there were faith leaders, priests and pastors, living there 365 days a year completely ignored by this large initiative. What a no-brainer. Let's get them together. Well, it may have been a no-brainer, but I'm telling you it has been tough work to create a lasting and sustaining innovative partnership. Lots of progress has been made. We have had pilot programs that have delivered great success.

But I have been sobered by the reality of how hard it is to create and sustain a true and lasting innovative partnership. That includes parties from both the faith-based and the secular and governmental sides of the camp. The challenges are many. Sometimes they are structural. In this case, for example, the religious leaders were really fragmented, not really one or two groups you could go talk to. So that's a structural challenge. Sometimes the challenges are emotional, both groups concerned about the implications of partnering with each other and what that would create. Sometimes they are intellectual, misunderstandings about what is allowed under the First Amendment of the Constitution or, as we heard earlier, kind of secular professionals, really not wanting to create the space, as one of the speakers said, for those who come from a faith perspective. We wrestled with both of those things on this suicide initiative. My point is this. These partnerships are difficult, even when you think they ought to be easy. Innovative community partnerships are devilishly hard to pull off, to create and sustain. And that leads me to my overarching implication I want to share with you, and it is this. These innovative community partnerships, which are possible and essential for our country going forward, are not going to be created and are not going to be sustained unless state governments and city governments dedicate hard-working men and women to making them happen. They won't. And I am so thrilled we have got 35 states and now Guam with liaisons and offices around there, but 35 is not enough. We need 50 plus Guam and Puerto Rico and anywhere else we can go.

The future of this initiative is not going to be dictated by what happens here in Washington with the transition in administrations. It just won't. Now, it is important, of course, but it doesn't live or die here. It lives or dies right where you and I live and die, in our states and in our cities. (Applause.)

So here is my challenge to all of you, especially those of you who are out there like myself plugging away in community and faith organizations. Make sure you remember to lift your eyes to your state leaders, to your city leaders, and tell them how critical it is that there at least would be a few. We have seen how far just three can go. And that is how many we have, by the way, in our office in Alaska, just a few dedicated and passionate women and men who will do the hard day in/day out work of bringing us all to the table, holding our feet to the fire, and saying, "These innovative partnerships are not only possible. They're essential. And we're going to do it." Thank you (Applause.)

PANEL MODERATOR MEDEFIND: All right. Thank you, Scott. Well, great human needs, great challenges to a future partnership, but at the same time a great record of accomplishment thus far, and great, great

promise for the years to come. And now, as we are coming to the close of our plenary time together, I want to make sure you know about one last opportunity, one last treat we have. The final set of workshops this afternoon, we could kind of call them dessert to the conference. There are approximately 15 brand new research papers. We had talked earlier today about how challenging it has been to get new research, serious research looking at innovative partnerships and the way that government and faith-based groups work together and the unique role of faith groups and the unique role of small secular community nonprofits to solving problems. And so we have a group of brand new research that has not been presented publicly yet spread throughout those workshops this afternoon. Also we would like you to note that on your tables or in your packets, I guess, you should have an evaluation sheet for the conference. We would really value any feedback that you would be willing to put into that, both the positives and the negatives, things that we can continue to learn from, because, as we said, innovative is ongoing. And, with that, I would like to thank each and every one of you for being a central part of what this is all about and for continuing to do that in the years ahead. (Applause.)